

ing its occupants. A storm of protest in the United States and a blunt United States ultimatum to Tito forced him to release the Americans and pay indemnity. But Tito then was considered a cold war enemy of the United States.

Suddenly a blast from Moscow changed all this. On June 28, 1948, the Communist International denounced Tito, in effect, for defying Stalin. Communists the world over soon were calling Tito a "traitor." Out of Moscow came orders to all Communists everywhere, Yugoslavia included, to overthrow Tito.

Inside Yugoslavia, however, Tito remained secure. The Yugoslav army, the Yugoslav Communist Party supported him. A wave of Yugoslav nationalism made him a hero at home. But the country, threatened by famine, desperate for machinery and raw materials, faced economic collapse. And the Yugoslav army, promised arms by Russia, got none, feared a Soviet attack.

The United States gamble on Tito dates from this period. The Yugoslav dictator appealed for western help, though still insisting that he was a Communist.

Calculated risk by the United States was designed to make Yugoslavia an example to the countries still under Soviet rule. Idea was—and still is—to show that the satellites could break with Stalin and survive.

#### LOOSE TIES WITH WEST

Thanks largely to United States aid over the last 8 years, Yugoslavia has prospered. As the United States sent hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to the country, Tito gradually made his peace with the West through a number of loose alliances.

Through these years, however, Yugoslavia remained a Communist dictatorship. Tito's rule, while more liberal than Moscow's rule, was that of a police state. Yugoslavia never

joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, often turned up on the Communist side of votes within the United Nations. There was much criticism of United States aid to Communist Yugoslavia within the United States Congress, but the aid continued to flow.

Stalin's death in Moscow brought a sharp change in Russia's policy toward Yugoslavia. A year ago, Nikita Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders went to Belgrade to confess Stalin's errors in breaking with Tito.

#### ESTEEM FOR RUSSIA

For a year Tito played hard to get. Just last October he received United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at Brijuni, his magnificent island estate in the Adriatic, for friendly talks. Now Tito has gone to Moscow to be received as a Communist hero, a friend of the Soviet Union's new leaders. Here is what he has to say about the future of Yugoslav relations with Russia:

"The common struggle of our peoples from 1941 to the end of the war against the common foe testifies to the great truth that our fates are inseparable and that there is much for which we can value and esteem each other. However, dear friends, something unheard of and tragic nevertheless took place, and neither the people of Yugoslavia nor the people of the Soviet Union were responsible for this.

"We were greatly pained, but we believed that the time would come when everything separating us would be overcome and when our friendship would receive a new and still more firm foundation. This time has come, thanks to the Leninist policy of the government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"The arrival of Comrades Khrushchev, [Premier Nikolai A.] Bulganin and [Soviet trade boss Anastas I.] Mikoyan and others

in Belgrade, the talks with them, the declaration which was drawn up on that occasion, and afterward the courageous and farsighted foreign policy of the collective leadership of the Soviet Union are, in my profound conviction, a guaranty that nothing of the kind will ever happen again between the two countries marching along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin."

#### ALERT IN THE PENTAGON

Tito's game, whatever it is, has shaken the United States. Senators heard Yugoslav exiles testify that Tito has helped Moscow all along. The House banned all aid to Tito unless the President orders that it be continued.

The Pentagon's experts, when United States military aid first went to Yugoslavia, had trouble finding out just how the aid was used. Now, however, several hundred United States military men are moving about in Yugoslavia checking up on United States equipment and providing the United States with valuable intelligence on the whole area.

Yugoslavia's army, these observers report, now has so much United States equipment that it is dependent on a 50-million-dollar flow of parts and supplies from the United States to keep going. Tito, once again, would become completely dependent on Russia if United States aid ended.

Tito himself, in Moscow, coolly said: "Our relations with the United States will not suffer." And Tito's friends say he knows he will be in trouble with his own Yugoslavs if he breaks his United States ties.

In the weeks just ahead, however, American policy makers will be taking another look at Tito. They must decide whether Tito has enough independence left to warrant any United States aid, or whether he is back on Moscow's side after a billion-dollar build-up from the United States.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at the noon hour of this new day, we are coming unto Thee for wisdom and guidance for Thou alone art our light when we walk in darkness and our only source of courage and hope when we are haunted by fears.

We beseech Thee to illumine our minds with insight and understanding and lift our hearts to loftier heights of joy and peace.

Grant that we may never yield to doubt and despair but make us confident that Thou hast for all mankind a great and glorious purpose.

May we seek to bring to fulfillment that wise and beneficent purpose by accepting Thy blessings as a sacred trust and using them as contributions with which to minister to the needs of humanity.

Inspire us daily to rejoice in Thy abounding grace and goodness, which is always willing to forgive us when we have sinned and to restore us to Thy fellowship when we have gone astray.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ON AINSWORTH UNIT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9132) to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the report approved by the Secretary of the Interior on November 21, 1955, demonstrating the physical and economic feasibility of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, integrated as a part of said project by the act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 757), is hereby approved: *Provided*, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from the project authorized by this act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCormack). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection. The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INCREASED MILK CONSUMPTION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, our national milk production for 1956 is on the way to an alltime high.

These words may sound ominous because of the dairy-surplus problem—and they are ominous. Dairy farmers have suffered loss of income steadily for years. Government purchases of dairy products to support prices has cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Actually, however, these words need not have an ominous meaning. We face, in fact, a strange paradox. On the one hand, we have great dairy surpluses but, on the other hand, surveys have found that a shocking number of our children

and teen-agers suffer from malnutrition because they fail to drink enough milk.

Surveys of our youngsters have found, too, that poorly balanced diets are by no means limited to families with low incomes. Many children from families of above-average income also fail to drink enough milk, the greatest single health-giving food we have.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have been concerned with the large number of draftees that the military services have found physically defective because of malnutrition.

The dairy industry is to be highly commended for the promotional campaign it has undertaken to boost consumption, for this is one of the most obvious answers to the dairy-surplus problem. When we say that the country has a surplus of several billion pounds of milk, it sounds like a staggering amount. Yet, if everybody would just drink a little more milk each day—even less than a full glass—the surplus could turn into a shortage.

New products which offer promise of increased milk consumption are appearing on the market. One such product is a powdered milkshake mix which can be used at home and is particularly effective in getting children to enjoy their daily milk.

On Wednesday afternoon, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and I are giving a milkshake-mix party in the Capitol for a group of Washington children. It is my hope that this party will dramatize the need for increased milk consumption and the effect which new products such as milkshake mix can have on that consumption.

I am pleased to invite my colleagues to join with Senator WILEY and me in our children's milkshake mix party.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 500, Rept. No. 2120), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10936) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

#### HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 426), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on Agriculture of Thursday, February 10, 1955, incident to the presentation of a portrait of Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY to the Committee on Agriculture be printed as a House document with suitable binding.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NORTHWEST AIRLINES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial regarding Northwest Airlines appeared recently in the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

##### STRUGGLING NORTHWEST

Northwest Airlines has met with difficulties in Washington in efforts to obtain a permanent operating certificate for its northern or great-circle route to the Orient.

Its most recent setback in this respect has attracted attention in Congress and in aviation publications. The American Aviation Daily says a political storm is building up involving the Civil Aeronautics Board, a congressional committee, and the White House. In the picture is Pan American Airways, which operates a central trans-Pacific route and seeks Government permission to move into Northwest's northern territory.

Northwest Airlines is handicapped in long-range planning by lack of a permanent operating status on the trans-Pacific route which it pioneered and developed during the past decade or more. The Civil Aeronautics Board recommended permanent certification in December of 1954. However, in January 1955, President Eisenhower disapproved the recommendation on the ground that Northwest was operating on a subsidized basis.

Subsequently Government records showed that subsidies had ended January 1, 1955, thus removing the objections cited by the White House. Since then Northwest Airlines has been trying to get the matter reconsidered on the basis of the new evidence. The CAB agreed to reopen the matter in connection with a May 8 hearing on an application by Pan American for permission to compete with Northwest on the northern route. Northwest asked that this hearing consider its certification and also a proposal that it be permitted to compete with Pan American on the central route if Pan American should move into the great circle.

The CAB decided such an expanded hearing would be fair to all, and approved the agenda. Then an aviation specialist on the White House staff protested. He asked the CAB to limit the May 8 proceedings to the one issue of Pan American expansion into the northern route. This the CAB did, although there was no precedent for such a procedural reversal.

Since this is the situation, Northwest is seeking a separate CAB hearing on permanent certification. This at least should be granted. Since the CAB recommendation for a permanent certificate was overturned on the basis of incorrect subsidy figures, justice calls for reexamination of the case with all the facts now available.

#### ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 230) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of the hear-

ings on H. R. 5550, a bill authorizing the President to accept membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, held by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the said committee.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 456) authorizing the printing as a House document of material relating to the Central Valley project of California, and additional copies for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a House document certain material relating to the Central Valley project of California, and that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 1,000 additional copies.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BALTIC STATES COMMITTEE AND COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 454) to provide funds for the expenses of conducting studies, investigations, and inquiries incurred by the Select Committee on the Baltic States, and by the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations (1) authorized to be conducted by the Select Committee created by House Resolution 346, 83d Congress, as amended by House Resolution 438 of such Congress, and (2) authorized to be conducted by the Special Committee created by House Resolution 217, 83d Congress, in the amount of \$909,777, and in addition, the unexpended balance of \$723.12 heretofore made available for conducting such studies and investigations by such Special Committee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized and approved by the Committee on House Administration, and signed by the chairman thereof.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to my friend and ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman explain the provisions of this resolution?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has to do with obligations left over by two select committees—one being the so-called Baltic States Committee and the other the Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations. The obligations incurred by these committees were incurred before the end of



the life of the committees. It was not anticipated that they would exceed their authorized expenditures. I might say further, Mr. Speaker, that this is not to be considered a precedent. But, be that as it may, the individuals and the firms who were left holding the bag, so to speak, were innocent purchasers. That being the case, we feel these obligations of the Government of the United States to these people should be paid.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is true, of course, that the two committees did expend more money than they were authorized to spend but only by about \$500 in the case of each committee; is that not correct?

Mr. BURLESON. That is true and the obligations were incurred before the end of the Congress which authorized and created the committees.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Then after investigation it did appear that they were genuine obligations of the Government? But most certainly we are not in this resolution setting up a precedent for future committees to go beyond their authorization and appropriation.

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct, and I appreciate the gentleman's reemphasizing that the Committee on House Administration will definitely not recognize this action as forming a precedence for approval of accounts of this nature, or under similar circumstances in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EMPLOYEE AUTHORIZED FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer privileged resolution (H. Res. 468) authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to employ one additional employee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ one additional employee to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADDITIONAL CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer privileged resolution (H. Res. 440) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of 15 additional privates, Capitol Police force, office of the Sergeant at Arms, at a basic salary rate of \$2,160 per annum each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 465) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, upon vouchers authorized and approved by the Committee on House Administration and signed by the chairman thereof, such sums as may be necessary to restore or otherwise adjust the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms by the amount of any incorrect payments made therefrom as the result of errors not the result of bad faith or lack of due care made in cashing checks or making change while carrying out the functions of such office.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, after the word "That", insert "until otherwise provided by law."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I wonder if the gentleman would care to explain this resolution to the House.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman's question is certainly one that I would expect him to ask and it should be explained because of the unusual nature of the resolution.

In carrying out the functions of his office, the Sergeant at Arms, acting through certain employees, cashes checks, and makes change, for the Members of the House and for the officers and employees of the House. These duties correspond generally to the duties performed by tellers in a commercial bank for the customers of the bank. In making change and cashing checks, a certain amount of error is inevitable and, even though these errors seldom involve more than relatively insignificant amounts, sound accounting procedures require that the books be adjusted from time to time to reflect these errors. In order to provide for such adjustment of their books, most commercial banks maintain what is generally referred to as an "over and under account" for each teller, and this account is charged with the day-to-day shortages and overages which are the result of those errors made by the teller in making change or cashing checks, and which are not the result of negligence or bad faith on his part. Since the banking activities of the Sergeant at Arms are not operated for profit, there are no surplus or other funds available against which tellers' shortages may be charged, as is true in the case of the "over and under accounts" maintained by the commercial banks. In addition, the bankers' blanket bond issued with respect to the office of the Sergeant at Arms states specifically that it does not cover any shortage in any teller's cash due to error.

Therefore, at the present time, there is no way by which the books of the Sergeant at Arms may be adjusted to take care of this type of error.

The sole purpose of this resolution is to authorize, until otherwise provided by law, the payment out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by the Committee on House Administration and signed by the chairman thereof, of the amounts which may be necessary to restore or otherwise adjust the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms by reason of the type of error not the result of bad faith or lack of due care, heretofore referred to.

I think we may correctly refer to it as a matter of attrition over the last 10 years. The committee made several inquiries from bankers who tell us that the small amount is an exceedingly good record, because there are days in the office of the Sergeant at Arms when they handle as much as \$125,000. So over a period of 10 years there has become what is called a small imbalance. That is to correct the books and to provide that in the future there shall be an allowance for these small adjustments.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It would be fair to say there is no evidence of wrongdoing or bad faith. It is simply more likely that a small mistake has been made in making change from time to time?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. There is absolutely no question in anyone's mind, certainly not in the mind of any member of the committee, that there was any mismanagement or dishonesty.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And it is correct to say there is no evidence of wrongdoing?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 479 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and pending

that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule as the reading indicated, making in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2840, known as the library bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to make an extensive presentation of this legislation; that will be done by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], and the ranking member of the committee on the other side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], and others.

I do want to state in the outset that it is a bill that I have been conclusively sold upon. The question of public libraries is one I am sure that appeals to us all.

Every facet of library extension in this bill has been studied intensely by librarians, trustees, and civic leaders for more than a decade. It didn't just happen. Its provisions have evolved out of a mass of experience at the State and local level in attempting to provide reading materials for the rural segment of our population. States have not waited for this legislation to get some library extension programs underway. In many areas, the bookmobile has become a familiar part of the rural landscape. The funds, small as they are, which will be made available under the provisions of this act, will allow those already formulated State plans to continue to grow and will aid them in demonstrating what good library service is and what its results will be in the life of the community.

I have been given the opportunity to examine first hand the philosophy and skills of many of the people who will be putting this Library Services Act into operation. Whenever these library extension leaders have had any money from whatever source I have found a dedicated adherence to the very sound principle of helping an area only when and after it has done something for itself. An examination of every State plan submitted thus far toward implementation of this act seems to have that principle very deep rooted. Without exception they bear a complete recognition of the terminal features of this piece of legislation. Plans for use in each State include complete local subsistence at the end of this period. Not only have these leaders said they understand this terminal aspect; they have borne it out in the practical plans they have drawn up. Indeed, they are already working now in their own States in the framework of just such thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the placing within the reach of the people of this great democracy the books they desire to read to improve their minds and to make them better citizens, is a subject that is close to the hearts of all of us. In our great metropolitan centers we have a rather extensive public-library system, making available to the people of these urban centers this great wealth of knowledge and opportunity to improve their minds and mental processes; but, unfortunately, in the rural sections

of this country those people are denied the opportunity that is enjoyed so abundantly by the people in the great metropolitan areas.

So there has arisen in this country a movement, largely sponsored by the American Library Association and the several States of the Union, to install a system of bookmobiles whereby the books are carried into the rural sections and everyone living in those sections have this wealth of knowledge available to them at their door. This is an essential part of the library movement if we are to make these books available to them.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to impress upon the Members of the House the great importance of this program. I have seen it in operation for several years in the rural areas of east Tennessee. The appearance of the bookmobile in small rural areas is looked forward to. They have done a fine job and I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, who, although he has a great urban center in his congressional district, also has a large rural section in the mountains of the State of Tennessee that do not enjoy the opportunities that are enjoyed by the people of the city of Knoxville, for instance. I think the gentleman is making a worthwhile contribution when he sponsors this movement to make available to those rural people this service.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is so written that it carries out that purpose I have been trying to impress upon you and which the gentleman from Tennessee has just mentioned. A large part of our population is in rural areas.

In my own State there are 1,218,951 people without even a semblance of public library service. There are also 272,439 whose libraries are so inadequately supported that they cannot be called real libraries.

The Mississippi Library Commission working in close cooperation with the Mississippi Library Association, the State Department of Education and the University of Mississippi developed a sound plan for economical, practical library development throughout the State. This plan is being implemented continually. The passage of the Library Service bill would mean a greatly accelerated program of library development in my State during the 5 years of the program. This legislation will provide the stimulation needed to increase the interest and the support necessary at the State and local levels so that our public libraries can take their important place in our educational system.

It was revealed in the hearings on this measure that about 27 million people in the United States are without access to local public library services and of this number, 90 percent live in rural areas. There are also some 53 million more who receive only inadequate public library service. This bill is designed to bring library service to these people.

This lack of public library service is not a local problem, but one which is nationwide. No State in our great country provides adequate library service for all of its citizens. This legislation will therefore benefit citizens all over our land.

The free tax-supported library, where it has been well supported, is recognized as an integral part of public education. The public library is essential not only to the process of education but in the dissemination of information. Every citizen needs to have access all his life to sources of information for education is a lifelong process. Children need to have access to a public library to supplement their school work and to provide them with reading materials during the vacation period. Young people need guidance in vocations and other areas as they grow. Businessmen need the ready reference material provided by an adequate and efficient public library. Adults should have access to a public library which provides the one opportunity for continuing education throughout life regardless of the amount of formal education they have had.

Now, some objection is made to the Federal Government getting into this field. To be perfectly candid with you, I had some reservations about this myself in the beginning, because, generally speaking, I belong to that conservative school that believes, wherever possible, the States should assume the responsibilities for those functions that are properly a State function. But the thing that appeals to me about this particular piece of legislation is the fact that it has a curtailment date. The bill would authorize \$7.5 million for 5 years, making a total of \$37.5 million. Now, in that 5-year period we have been already asked to contribute more money than that for the assistance to foreign nations under the foreign aid program to help those people over there have books available. Here is an opportunity to do something for our people at home and to do something for the rural people of this Nation, who, after all, are the bulwark of democracy in this country. Ours was a rural nation that was founded in the beginning; and we must see to it now that the rural people of this country are not neglected.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few days there appeared in two of the great outstanding conservative newspapers of this country editorials commending this legislation. I shall not take the time of the House, because we want to get on with this legislation, to read these splendid editorials in detail. One of them appeared in the Washington Star on yesterday under the title "The Library Services Bill," and I quote the first paragraph only:

There is really no good reason why any American should be cut off from public library service just because they happen to live outside of the cities. The public library has been called the university of the people and so it is a blessing of democracy and an aid to it.

In the New York Times, quoting another paragraph from that article:

This bill would grant a total of \$7.5 million a year for 5 years to States matching



the grants. The objective is to bring books and other library services to rural families who have none at all and to improve library service for an additional 53 million Americans whose libraries are inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, the States have control over the distribution of these funds. And there are ample safeguards in the bill against Federal domination, something none of us want. There are many other things I would like to say on this bill but I shall content myself with this final statement. I have had an opportunity in my rural State of Mississippi to see this program work. It works well. Here is a bill not to put the Federal Government on a permanent basis into the library field but a bill to give an impulse, to accentuate the spreading of the library service. I might add that I think there were 27 bills introduced in this session of the Congress and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Of course, the committee could not report out all of the bills, but no doubt out of deference to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], her bill was reported by the committee. The bills, I understand, were all similar. I commend the gentlewoman, along with the others, for her sponsorship of the legislation. I should also like to complement the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. BARDEN, a conservative and well balanced statesman who always has his feet on the ground and the interest of the Republic at heart. His endorsement of this legislation is a refutation of any charge of socialism or that it is an invasion of States rights.

Mr. Speaker, the two editorials to which I referred, the one from the New York Times under date of May 5, and the one from the Washington Evening Star of May 7, are herewith submitted for the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 5, 1956]

#### LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

The library services bill, H. R. 2840, is now before the House. The list of sponsors is bipartisan.

This bill would grant a total of \$7,500,000 a year for 5 years to States matching the grants. The objective is to bring books and other library services to rural families who have none at all, and to improve library services for an additional 53 million Americans whose libraries are inadequate. The States and localities will have complete authority under the program established by the bill.

In the great cities we are accustomed to impressive library service. Our cousins in the villages and on the farms are entitled to it too. This legislation would stimulate the extension services of the various States and the regional cooperative services based on metropolitan centers. The funds proposed are modest, the period limited. It is believed that local communities in rural areas, having tasted the advantages of good libraries, would then wish to continue the services with local and State funds.

The free public library is a vital symbol of educational opportunity, and it is to be hoped that Congress will pass H. R. 2840.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1956]

#### LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

There is really no good reason why any Americans should be cut off from public

library service just because they happen to live outside of cities. The public library has been called the university of the people and so it is—a blessing of democracy and an aid to it. The art of reading, which Bacon tells us "maketh a full man," has not, despite the magnetic distraction of television, suffered a complete decline. The sale of the classics in cheap paper-bound editions gives heartening evidence that the desire to match minds with the great writers of the past has not died. The tremendous popularity of the bookmobiles, which have been lumbering through rural regions as stop-gap means of distribution, attests that a large hungry clientele exists.

Tomorrow the House will consider—we trust favorably—a bill which would bring the pleasures of book borrowing within reach of the many Americans currently deprived. The library services bill would provide a total of \$7.5 million annually for 5 years for the construction and operation of libraries in rural areas, fringe areas around large cities and impacted areas. Previous similar measures have fallen before objections that public library service is solely the responsibility of the States and that Federal financing would lead to Federal control. H. R. 2840 meets these objections. It requires that all Federal funds must be matched by the States on an ability-to-pay formula and makes specific provision that the administration of the program be put in the hands of each of the States' library extension agency.

H. R. 2840 has the bipartisan sponsorship of 27 Representatives and 16 Senators. Its chief sponsor, the American Library Association, is hopeful of its passage. The House would do well to approve the bill and thus bring to everyone the instruction, diversion, and solace which books incomparably offer.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the adoption of the rule. I hope there will be very little, if any, opposition to the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised at the remarks of my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], who is an able member of the Rules Committee, on which I serve, with regard to this bill. Had I come into the Chamber while he was making his statement, it is conceivable I would have thought that he was talking, perhaps, about the school construction bill, or Federal aid to education by way of helping to pay teachers' salaries, or helping to pay administrative expenses of schools. I might even have thought that my good friend may have been talking about the Federal Government supplying books for the schools.

I am opposed to this bill because I feel that the Federal Government should stay apart from the States as much as possible and permit them to work out their own problems, especially with regard to education. I cannot conceive how anyone here can vote to put books in rural areas and have the Federal Government furnish the money for that, any more than they would be willing to vote to give Federal money to schools to pay teachers' salaries or to buy books for the schools.

In my opinion this bill is probably the strongest bill that has come before this

Congress that touches the question of States rights. The bill says:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the sum of \$7,500,000 which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner of Education—

That is, approved by some commissioner or bureaucrat or somebody here in Washington. Then the bill continues about these allotments to States. Then on page 3 of the bill we have a section concerning State plans, which reads:

To be approved under this section, a State plan for the further extension of public library services to rural areas must—

This is what the bill says the States must do. It must provide for the administration, or supervision of the administration, and so forth.

Subsection 2 states that a State plan must provide for the receipt by the State treasurer, or if there be no State treasurer, the officer exercising similar functions for the State, of all funds paid to the State pursuant to this act.

Subsection 3 says that the State plan must provide policies and methods of administration to be followed in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State plan.

Subsection 4 states that the State plan must provide that the State library administrative agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require.

Subsection 5 states that the State plan must provide that any library services furnished under the plan shall be made available free of charge under regulations prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

Paragraph (b) provides that the Commissioner shall approve any such plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

In order to get these handouts the States must forget all about States rights and follow the orders of some group of bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman knows that in the State of Illinois the schools furnish libraries supported by public taxation, that cities and villages have public libraries supported by taxation, that townships have libraries supported by taxation, and even the counties in our State have county libraries supported by taxation. Also the State has a State library with traveling libraries going all over the State, supported by taxation.

If the Federal Government is going to go into this library business it means that the State of Illinois in addition to paying taxes for all of these libraries available in the State of Illinois will pay into the Federal Treasury about 6 or 8 to 1 for every dollar it gets back in aid to public libraries. This is a States

rights problem, it seems to me, and not a Federal problem.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I fully subscribe to what he has just stated. I for one, I reiterate, cannot understand how anyone can possibly approve the Federal Government's going to the States and giving them books, and so forth, wherever it might be, any more than they can go in and appropriate money directly for school purposes, for education.

I think, and I have tried to follow this principle closely, that the Federal Government should stay out of education and attempting to participate in our school systems. I just as firmly believe that the Federal Government should stay out of religion and let a person follow the belief he chooses. I have followed these principles in the quarter of a century I have been in Congress, and I hope that now we do not get into this educational feature.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2840, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration one of the simplest measures it has been my privilege to encounter during the time I have served in the Congress. Because of its simplicity, I think, it offers more good to the general public than any other Federal assistance legislation that I have had the responsibility of studying. We should, I believe, go into as much detail as possible with reference to the provisions of the bill before making statements for or against the measure. To begin with, I should like to direct the attention of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, and the members of the Committee on Rules as well as other Members to the fact that there is in this bill absolutely nothing which refers to public-school education; absolutely no provision which has anything to do with the public schools of any State in these United States. And any reference or suggestion that this bill is an effort to go into that phase of our society is simply the result of a mis-

understanding of the legislation before us or the result of a desire to confuse the minds of those who would like to see the advancement of the general welfare of the people of America. To support that, let us look first at the very beginning of the bill in its declaration of policy. I believe it is generally known there is no one in this House whose requirement for the observation of States' rights as well as States' responsibilities and whose standards for measuring legislation protecting States rights is any higher than those advocated by your speaker. In the declaration of policy, it says in plain language these words:

It is the purpose of this act to promote the further extension by the several States of public-library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services.

There is no reference whatsoever to schools. Moreover, in the declaration of policy, it says:

The provisions of this act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public-library services.

Neither shall the interpretation or administration of this act apply in any way to the responsibility and authority of the States to select personnel, but listen to this: "Neither shall it apply to the selection of library books and material." All authority for selecting personnel, books, and materials is set out in the declaration of policy and under the terms of this act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

Now let us go to the next important provision of this bill, and that is the authorization for appropriations. This bill authorizes to be appropriated annually for a period of 5 years \$7.5 million, a total for the 5-year period of \$37.5 million. I would direct your attention to the fact that the budget request of the administration today for funds to support overseas library services is \$14.7 million annually, or almost exactly twice the sum which we seek to serve our own people of America.

Let us see how this allotment of \$7.5 million is to be made to the various States. First, each State, regardless of population, or regardless of any present library facilities, will receive an initial allotment of \$40,000, except the Virgin Islands, which shall receive an initial allotment of only \$10,000. The States and Territories, of course, must match these funds. The allotment is matched by the States from revenues raised by the State itself or by local subdivisions and matched in proportion to the State's per capita income to the national per capita income, limiting the Federal contribution in no instance to less than 33 percent, and in no instance to more than 66 percent.

Some mention was made of the State plans, which in my opinion support the declaration of policy announced at the outset of this discussion. To be approved under this section a State plan for further expansion of library service to rural areas must, and I agree with the emphasis which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] wanted to put on this word "must," but what must we do? First, the State itself, not the Federal Govern-

ment, not the Commissioner of Education, but the State itself must provide for the administration of the plan. By whom? It must provide for administration of the plan by the State library administrative agency, and it must provide that such State agency will have adequate authority under State law to administer the plan in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The State plan must also provide policies and methods of administration to cover the selection of personnel, to cover the selection of library books and materials. The determination of the best uses of the funds shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions. That, briefly and generally, covers the provisions of this bill. So let us propound these questions: Why do we have the bill? And why should it pass?

First, why do we have it? Twenty-seven identical bills were introduced into this House calling for this legislation. The 27 authors came from both sides of the aisle. There is absolutely nothing partisan, I believe, with regard to it. The mere fact that 27 Members of this House introduced legislation like this is announcement enough of the importance of this legislation. But let us see more about the importance and hear what developed during the hearings before the subcommittee.

In the subcommittee hearings it developed that 27 million Americans, 27 million people in the United States, are without any library service at all. Furthermore, it was shown that 53 million people in America are served by inadequate library facilities. The hearings also developed the fact that of the three-thousand-odd counties in these United States, there are 404 without any library service of any kind, private, public, or what have you.

Of the 7,500 library systems in the United States, 60 percent have less than \$4,000 annual support; 77 percent less than \$10,000. These hearings developed that it cost \$1.50 per capita to maintain a minimum library service. It developed that the cost would be \$2 to maintain what the American Library Association considers good service and that it cost \$3 per capita to maintain what we would like to have in America, and that is a superior library service.

Why do we provide authorization for \$7,500,000 annual appropriation and the \$40,000 annual basic allotment to each State?

First, it is estimated that the annual cost for a minimum library program in America is \$240 million. The \$7,500,000 is, roughly, 3 percent of that amount. The \$40,000 grant to each State is a minimum upon which the American Library Association feels a State can organize an efficient State and local set-up for this program.

The other 97 percent of local funds is to be made up in the best way the State and local subdivisions can find.

Emphasize again, will you, that this bill is for a 5-year period and is to serve as a stimulus only. It is hoped and believed by those who appeared before the committee that these subdivisions of the States and the States once the service becomes available, as the gentleman



from Tennessee pointed out about his counties awhile ago, the people will not again be without it.

Why should we pass this bill? For those of us who are hard-headed, stubborn gentlemen not wanting to add more expense to our budget, listen, will you, to some brief statements which reached the committee during the hearings. And first I would like to call attention to a statement made by Mr. M. M. Harris, editor of the San Antonio Free Press, of San Antonio, Tex., an outstanding businessman in America and a great leader in Texas. Among his other statements made in enthusiastic support of this bill he said:

I would like to read a very brief letter from our Governor, Allan Shivers.

This of course the committee permitted him to do; and he read the following:

I am glad to know that you are going to Washington to testify before the Congress on the plan of cooperation between the Federal Government and the various States in order to furnish better library service to the people of the Nation. It is my understanding that this proposed plan of cooperation will be similar to the Hill-Burton Act relating to hospital construction, but that the States, although required to enter into a fund-matching arrangement, would have complete administrative authority through State agencies, such as the State Library and Historical Commission of Texas.

My personal thought is that this would be a very worthwhile program. We have tried for years to increase State participation in library work, with little or no results. This might be the spark that is needed.

Certainly we cannot complain about States rights when the States refuse or fail to discharge their obligations.

That is not LANDRUM, of Georgia, talking to you, that is not any member of the Committee on Education and Labor talking to you; that is Governor Shivers who supported you on my left in 1952.

Let us look further at another distinguished man in America, Mr. Harry Schacter, of Indianapolis, Ind., formerly of Louisville, Ky. Mr. Schacter is one of the largest furniture retailers in America.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very able argument he is making on the pending bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. I am happy to have that from my distinguished friend.

Mr. Harry Schacter stated:

I am in business to make money. I know that to make money I must have around me people with purchasing power. I know that in order for people to have strong purchasing power they have got to have strong minds, great intellect, and sound unbiased information. I want to see this carried to the rural areas as much as I want it in my surrounding urban area where I am the owner of one of the largest retail furniture establishments in Indianapolis, Ind.

That is Mr. Harry Schacter talking to you.

I would like to call your attention to a very touching scene that occurred before the committee. It came as a complete surprise. That was the appearance of a

group of boys and girls from over here in Maryland somewhere, led by a young fellow by the name of Norman A. Pilkerton. This group walked in ostensibly to observe the hearings, to see what was taking place and to understand more about Congress and its functions. Someone suggested they might wish to make a statement and this young man, purely extemporaneously, stood and made a statement which I hope you will permit me to summarize, and which appears on page 117 of the hearings:

We do not have the facilities in our school to give us opportunity to do the research necessary to get the education we want. Our schools are open only 9 months each year. Give us the bookmobile. Many of us live 10 or 15 miles away from the public library that is available for us and only one or maybe no bookmobile is available. Let us have another bookmobile, let us have more books.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to compliment my colleague from the State of Georgia for a very splendid statement on behalf of this legislation and want to associate myself with him in support of the pending bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman, my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, if the Committee will indulge me a little more, I direct your attention to page 175 of the hearings where Mrs. Moore, a distinguished businesswoman and civic leader from Little Rock, Ark., made a splendid appeal for this bill in much the same vein as suggested by Mr. Schacter in his statement. You will find the statement of Mr. Schacter on page 132 of the hearings.

Beyond that, I should like to direct your careful attention to page 75 of the hearings where appears the report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and where it is shown that they do not oppose this legislation as it is written; neither does the Budget Director oppose it for in a letter directed to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor the closing sentence states:

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the bill.

Signed: "Roswell B. Perkins, Acting Secretary," and written from the Budget Director's office.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a scientific age; we are living now in a nuclear and atomic era; we are living at a time, mind you, when the man in the street must have some detailed knowledge of what is going on in the world, and the very least we can do is to provide for this man in the street, this everyday citizen, the opportunity to enlarge his intellectual possibilities and to grow in his educational achievements.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I may say to the gentleman that the people in my State are very much interested in this legislation, and

I am very much interested. I observe this tabulation on pages 3 and 4 of the report. The third column on pages 3 and 4 is headed "Allotment From Remaining Funds." Now, will the gentleman explain what that expression "remaining funds" means? Remaining from what?

Mr. LANDRUM. It is simply this: the bill provides that an initial allotment shall be made to each State of \$40,000, regardless of the State's population or its library facilities, and \$10,000 to the Virgin Islands. Now, this \$40,000 and that \$10,000 for the States and that Territory must also be matched under the same formula, but the additional fund about which the gentleman directs his question, the additional allotment, is over and above that \$40,000 for each State, and the \$10,000 that would be allotted to the Virgin Islands. The \$40,000 multiplied by 48 is taken from the \$7.5 million, and the balance then is allotted among the States for matching.

Mr. HALE. What puzzles me is the expression "remaining funds." Remaining from what?

Mr. LANDRUM. It remains from funds that are left after the allocation of the \$40,000 for each State. The initial allocation to each State is \$40,000, and what remains is allocated to each State on the basis of its own rural population to the rural population of the United States.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to compliment the gentleman and the committee for bringing this bill out and the fine statement he has made in support of it. The bill has my full support.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, this bill would provide for distributing \$7½ million each year for 5 years, a total of \$37½ million among the various States for the purpose of promoting "the further extension of public-library services to rural areas without such services or inadequate services."

Each State would get a basic allotment of \$40,000 per year plus an additional allotment based on a formula.

The American Library Association's figures show there is no person without library service in 3 States, namely, Massachusetts, Delaware, and Rhode Island; they would be given \$111,098; \$51,637 and \$51,761 each year provided they put up so-called matching funds of \$128,131; \$104,839 and \$54,941, respectively.

Massachusetts is now spending \$2.10 per capita per year for public-library service; Ohio, \$1.77; New York, \$1.50; Indiana, \$1.14; Oregon, \$1.07; Missouri, \$1; Illinois, 95 cents; Virginia, 33 cents; Mississippi, 30 cents; Arkansas, 27 cents; and Texas, 26 cents.

According to the testimony presented to the Committee on Education and Labor by supporters of this legislation, there were 661 counties without public-library service in 1946; 488 without such

service in 1952; and, by last year, only 404 counties not having public libraries. This is a real do-it-yourself attitude on the part of the States and local communities—it is the American way. It shows the number of counties without what the advocates of this bill consider adequate library service has been reduced by 257, or 38.8 percent, in only 8 years—and without Federal subsidy.

It also should be pointed out that 338 of the 404 counties in the United States, purportedly without library service, are concentrated in 12 States. In fact, 263 of them are in 7 States.

According to testimony received by our committee on a similar bill in 1950, approximately 35 million were without library service; and by last year, a little less than 27 million were without such service. Here again, it is shown that local and State financial sources have been able to bring this service to 8 million more people within a 5-year period; or, in other words, reduce the number of those without such service by almost 23 percent.

Federal aid, in housing, or welfare, or education, or anything else, always involves Federal control. Many Federal grants-in-aid for other purposes have often led to undesirable Federal influence and control over policies and programs—the same might occur in this case.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me if there is any provision to insure that none of the funds provided in this bill will be used in such a way as to bring about racial discrimination or segregation in these library units that go out?

Mr. COON. I do not have the answer to that question; I am not sure. Probably some of the Members from other localities in the United States could answer that question, but I do not happen to know.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could refer the question to somebody who could tell us. I notice that the statement has been made that these funds would be administered in the same way that the Hill-Burton funds are administered. I understand they are administered under the laws of the particular States where the grants are used.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. There is nothing in this bill about segregation or whether the funds are used under the laws of the State, or anything like that. The situation here is not analogous to that under the Hill-Burton Act which says that where separate but equal facilities are provided there must be a distribution of funds on a separate but equal basis. These funds are to be administered under the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Presumably under the Constitution and the laws of the United States they would be administered as other funds have been required to be

administered under the recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. PELLY. No separate but equal bookmobiles would go out.

Mr. METCALF. No separate but equal bookmobiles would go out. There is no language whatever in the bill as to that.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COON. I think the gentleman might get additional information if he would ask the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee chairman.

The provision of public library services is a State and local concern. The Federal Constitution does not assign the Federal Government responsibility for public libraries. It leaves this responsibility to the States and local communities. For many years the Federal Government has been assuming more and more of State and local responsibilities in government. It is time for a reversal instead of an extension of this trend.

If this measure is passed it may become a permanent activity of the Federal Government. There is nothing to prevent later extension of the time limitations contained in the bill. Within recent decades the Congress has often extended legislation which initially was termed temporary. This legislation may follow the same course. At the end of the 5-year period the claim may be made that the goal sought has not been reached, and there may be repeated pleas for renewal of the law until it is made permanent.

The following excerpt from a report entitled "The Public Library in the United States" was placed in the record by Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, the United States Commissioner of Education:

Federal aid for stimulation purposes under present conditions must be carefully designed if it is to achieve its purpose. Under our governmental system Federal grants to public libraries would be administered by the State library agencies. These agencies vary greatly in size, resources, and quality of professional personnel. They vary also in the extent to which they have developed mature plans and leadership for building adequate, modern library service units within the State. The estimate, from our survey, is that not more than half the present State library agencies are developed sufficiently to provide assurance that Federal grants would not be frittered away in activities yielding no permanent results.

The proposed legislation contained in the bill we have before us, along with identical and similar proposals, have been disapproved by both the Democratic and Republican administrations over the past years. The position of the prior administration was reiterated as late as July 1951 in a report on a similar bill by the Bureau of the Budget:

In the preparation of the President's program for the fiscal year 1952, careful consideration was given to a number of programs which would aid in the development of our national strength over the long run. Under the circumstances, only the highest priority programs could be included. For this reason, although assistance to the States to develop public library services in rural areas is a meritorious proposal, it is not included in the program of the President and its enactment at this time would not be in accord with that program.

And last year, under date of May 20, in a letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the position of the present administration was reflected as follows:

This Department is in accord with the broad objective of H. R. 1753 and H. R. 2861; namely, to improve the public-library services available to the rural areas of the Nation. However, having regard to budgetary limitations, and in view of other more urgent needs for Federal funds in the fields of education, health, and welfare, we would not regard this as a priority measure. Furthermore, the grant-in-aid program proposed by H. R. 1753 and H. R. 2861 should be considered in relation to the general Federal policy with respect to all such grant-in-aid programs, a matter which is currently under study by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations established by President Eisenhower pursuant to Public Law 109, 83d Congress.

Further to quote from that report, it states:

We would, therefore, recommend that H. R. 1753 and H. R. 2861 not be enacted by the Congress at this time.

A few moments ago my good colleague from Georgia quoted from the Bureau of the Budget saying they were not opposed to this legislation, but this is what this letter states:

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

The report is that they are opposed to this bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman sat on the committee and he knows from the discussion before the committee that the Department through its agent, Dr. Brownell, stated that it was not opposed to the legislation but it was opposed to its adoption at this time. Now is not that the true representation of what was said?

Mr. COON. I am not sure. I was not there when it was before the full committee.

Mr. LANDRUM. You will not say it was not; will you?

Mr. COON. I do not know, but I will say that this letter says the Bureau of the Budget is in agreement with the report which is opposed to the legislation.

Mr. LANDRUM. The letter itself from which you are reading does not say it opposes the legislation. If you will read on, and read the full letter which is contained in the record of the hearing, it says it opposes adoption at this time.

Mr. COON. Yes, at this time.

It does not say that they would be in favor of it at some later time either; they say they are opposed to it at this time—I take it that is what it means.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COON. I would like to complete my statement.

Mr. LANDRUM. I would like to ask the gentleman one question further, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. COON. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman.



Mr. LANDRUM. Can the gentleman think of a better time to offer to the general public and to the American people an opportunity to expand their intellectual potential and the opportunity for educational achievement than the present time when we are today spending billions of dollars overseas to do that for other people?

Mr. COON. That is a good thing to do at any time, but I am opposed to the Federal Government getting into more aid programs. I might say it appears the pressure and agitation behind this bill comes from the American Library Association and their method of operation can be demonstrated by a letter circulated in one of the States by a State library association, when this type bill was before our committee in 1952. In part this communication states:

Congressmen and Senators are impressed by persistence, and they are sensitive to their mail. The brushoff is an old political maneuver. If a Member of Congress from your State needs convincing, keep writing no matter how your first letters are answered. You may change his mind. If you keep after him, he will know you mean business. If you relax your efforts, he presumes correctly that your interest is only temporary. Success demands that your efforts be persistent and sustained.

I can appreciate everyone's interest, and especially that of the American Library Association, in making public library services available to everyone in our country. However, I should like to point out that many feel that any inadequacies which may exist in some communities can best be taken care of on the State or local level rather than placing reliance on the so-called painless method of distributing federally collected taxes. I should also like to point out that the formula for allotting the funds does not have as a basis of payment the actual need of the respective States for such additional services.

In all of the hearings before the committee, we had very little requests for support or hope for this legislation from anybody who was going to benefit from it in the rural areas. I did in the last few days get a letter or two and a telegram or two, but that is the first I heard from anybody who was going to benefit from the libraries or from reading the books in the libraries.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to support the library services bill, H. R. 2840, that is now being considered.

This bill has bipartisan sponsorship. Its chief sponsor is the American Library Association.

The American Library Association is to be commended for the fine work it has put forth in behalf of this timely, constructive proposal. It provides for the States matching the grants up to \$7,500,000 a year for 5 years.

At this particular time, we are greatly in need of what this bill will provide when enacted into law.

In a hearing on automation last fall before a subcommittee of the Joint Com-

mittee on the Economic Report, of which I was chairman, shocking information was revealed. In a comparison of educational systems between this country and Russia, it was disclosed at this hearing that while we are graduating 25,000 engineers in 1956, Russia will graduate 50,000 engineers. During 1956, we will graduate 50,000 technicians, but Russia will graduate 32 times that number—1,600,000 technicians.

So we are considering this bill at a time when we are challenged by Russia on educational attainments.

A democracy must have a well-informed citizenship in order to perform at its best.

The objective of this bill is to bring books and other library services to rural families. It will really help over 50 million Americans whose libraries are inadequate.

The Federal Government will not have any control over the administration of this act. The States and local communities will have complete authority under the program established by this bill. Just because people reside outside of cities is not a good reason for them to be deprived of adequate library services.

This bill will bring book-borrowing within the reach of many good American citizens who are, at the present time, deprived of the opportunity.

I congratulate the committee for reporting this bill, and I certainly hope that it passes by a large majority.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this library bill has been before the Committee on Education and Labor before. The committee has given very, very thorough study to the whole problem. Of course, opposition can arise in connection with any bill that may be brought to the floor of the House, but I think it is about time that we took a little stock of our development in the field of education.

Here we are, pressing national defense, pressing foreign aid, spending money everywhere, but I fear we have our sights lifted a little too high. I think it is a matter of common knowledge that the Defense Department, for instance, is spending more money in the United States in the field of education than the entire public school system of America. It does not make good sense to me that we should completely neglect our responsibility for making available to the kids out in the country through these bookmobiles an opportunity to get some of the education that sooner or later the Government is going to have to take care of through its defense agencies, which were never designed to conduct an educational setup in this country. Yet they have gradually worked themselves in.

Take another look at the farm situation. We are spending many, many times the money in other countries so they can do identically the same thing that is set up in this bill. I try to be frank, but as far as State rights, to which the gentleman referred, I would take a lie-detector test, or most any other kind of a test on State rights.

It may be I am getting a little hardened because we have had so many

things done to us in late years that violated that principle so much. Maybe I am getting a little callous and not quite as sensitive. I see no State rights question involved here. I see the responsibility of the 48 States in this Union involved. I see no integration involved. If there was, my speech would be different from what it is, as far as that is concerned.

This is to carry books around through the country to kids, regardless of color, creed, or anything else, and make the books available to them.

Twenty-four years ago I led the fight in the State legislature, not just to help one particular type of school but to help raise the salaries and put in a better system in all the schools of North Carolina. It is not a new thing for me to be interested in education.

Now we come down to the expenditure of the money. These bookmobiles have been operating in North Carolina in a limited way for many years. Not adequate, no, but doing the best we can in a small way. The State of North Carolina has demands upon it, and increasing demands, just like the Federal Government, but what position does it find itself in today? The people of the State of North Carolina are as ambitious and as progressive-minded as any people on this earth. But the Federal Government has invaded every single source of revenue heretofore enjoyed by the States. That has been my song for 20 years—we are bleeding the source of revenue to the States—we are bleeding them white and offering them no alternative.

I shall not forget a statement made by a superintendent of schools from the State of North Carolina when he was appearing before the committee on the question of education.

My friend from New York asked:

Do you mean that you are in favor of the Federal Government going down and collecting money and then going through all the expensive ramifications of accounting for it and sending part of it back to you?

Dr. Carroll's reply to him was:

Congressman, I prefer to say that in my own language. I say to you, Mr. Congressman, either leave more of it down there for us to carry on our necessary operations, or divide with us.

There is no answer to that, and yet we continue to invade State sources of revenue, we continue to bleed them white, we continue to throw money all over the face of the earth, we continue to multiply the services we extend to the kids in other lands. I am not mad with them, but I just love my folks a little more. Then when we come in with something that involves only \$7½ million—an amount that is scarcely as much as a measly tip in the foreign-aid program, we get very disturbed over it.

I do not know of a single dollar this Government spends that is more wisely, more beneficially spent than in the educational programs of this country—particularly vocational training and rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. The States have taken hold of them—they caught fire—and they are carrying on wonderful programs all over this Nation. All of us know that. They are

popular programs. But I remember when they were just starting—and I remember when this House adopted the policy of helping it, giving it added speed to go along and give some new life to the program. It worked, and right now they are turning out finished products in these vocational schools.

This will work too. I know it is good for my country. I know we have radio programs and television programs, but we had better give them a little solid diet to go along with that, and all of us realize that.

This is a program that does not violate anyone's ideas or views on the question of the Federal Government interfering in local affairs. This library service is on the same footing that the vocational training program was when it started. I like to use that as an illustration of what I think this will develop into. It is most difficult for men in cities where there are million-dollar libraries available to visualize life in country areas where maybe the kids ride 20 miles to the school building every morning. They cannot get the books, and the schools do not have the books. In this piece of legislation there is provision for this program to cooperate with the city libraries, to cooperate with the municipal libraries, and thereby each implement the other.

I picked up this statement. I do not know where it came from; I do not know who was the author, but it is very wise indeed: "Good books help to prevent youth erosion."

And I think there is something to it. We should do all we could to encourage the habit of reading. And if you do not think boys and girls like to read let me remind you that hundreds of millions of dollars are spent by them every year on comic books. Children do like to read, and they like to develop their minds. I think we can very readily give them the opportunity to develop their minds. In so doing we will prepare them for later life, whether it be in the defense activity or elsewhere. In so doing we will relieve the Federal Government of its ever expanding educational program in the Defense Department and the services. In so doing we will then better prepare them to make their way through school, high school, and into the college. In so doing we will encourage within them the desire for research to become technical men, engineers, doctors, medical men, and experts in the various fields. I say to you we must not forget that in olden days, back in the beginning of this country, most of the reading was done and most of the education was received by candlelight in the homes, far removed from school buildings.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his splendid statement made here today and wish to associate myself with his remarks. I intend to vote for the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman. I shall not dwell upon this longer or go into further detail. I just simply say that it can be put into operation

with a minimum of cost because there is already a department that is ready, able, and willing to carry on, set up in the Department of Education. The States are set up to carry it on because most of them are engaging in it to a very limited extent.

This program is for 5 years. I hope by the end of that time there will be no necessity for carrying it further, but, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to stand by this program and patiently wait to see the benefits develop.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman advise the committee what the administrative cost of the operation of this will be on the Federal level?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know exactly. It will not be very much because they have a branch already set up in the department.

Mr. BOW. This will create a new group?

Mr. BARDEN. No; it will not be a new department, nor will the States have to do that because most of them are carrying on this program in a limited way already.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to speak on this bill except to make the statement that I am opposed to it. However, some of the past discussion we have had here today leads me to want to make a few comments.

I am not opposed to helping people obtain books. I am not here to argue against reading as a vital necessity of a more rounded education. Having been raised in the parsonage of the church I know the value of reading and of spiritual thinking, so I would be the last to argue against that. However, we are face to face, as I see it in this particular matter, with the problem of jurisdiction—Federal and State. I am not a strict adherent of stopping aid programs at State lines. My past record will show I am willing to be flexible in connection with various programs for the benefit of all our people, but I have thought for many hours in my room how we could stop the trend toward centralization of power in the Federal Government. Not that I do not wish people to be helped—I think that is part of our duty on this earth. However, I do think that you have to combine human understanding with commonsense.

Mr. Chairman, I have felt, one of the best methods to bring to a halt or to slow up this rushing tendency toward the Federal Government doing everything, would be to avoid those programs which are of such insignificant size financially that the States could take care of them themselves. It is not a large amount of money, and I feel that there is not a State in the Union that could not handle its own rural library services problem. For that reason I have opposed this bill not only a few years ago but I have opposed it in our committee here within the last few months, not because I do not believe

in the purposes of it but I feel it is one thing that could be handled by the States and would not, therefore, become an additional impetus to the centralization of power in the Federal Government, which I am sure all of us deep within have a tendency to be uneasy about.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to continue these remarks. I am not seeking any controversy with people. I prefer to work out things if I can, and I honor the members of our committee on both sides of the aisle regardless of their opinions. I have worked with them long enough to know they sincerely believe in the strength and destiny of their country and also the welfare of the people. But, it is my desire to put this problem together in a sensible manner which will not add one more push to a growing centralization of authority and power in the Government which in the end will not be good for any single citizen of this country.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to congratulate the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the very fine presentation and the fine explanation they have made on this bill. I would like to go very briefly into the history of this legislation, because it is not legislation that has been just introduced this year. We go back to 1947 and find that Senator HILL and Senator AIKEN introduced similar legislation in the Senate. Bills have been introduced in every Congress since that time, and in the 84th Congress we find that there are 16 cosponsors of the Senate bills and there are 27 Members of this House who have introduced identical bills.

In the House the following Members have introduced identical legislation, and they are interested in this particular piece of legislation because they know the benefits that it will bring to their individual States:

Congresswomen Mrs. KEE, Mrs. GRIFITHS, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, Mrs. BOLTON; Congressmen ELLIOTT, ALBERT, MCCARTHY, BAILEY, PERKINS, PATMAN, ASHLEY, STEED, THOMPSON, MOLLOHAN, METCALF, FRANK SMITH, BURNSIDE, BYRD, TOLLEFSON, MERROW, JENKINS, YOUNG, FRELINGHUYSEN, BERRY, WAINWRIGHT, and BUDGE.

It is true that this particular bill has my name on it, but because many of these Members have worked far longer on this legislation than I, it probably could more accurately be called the Carl Elliott bill, the Phil Landrum bill, the Thomas Jenkins bill, or the Frank Smith bill.

Since I have been in the Congress, many times I have been asked whether it is an advantage or a disadvantage to be a woman. I am afraid, in this particular case, I would have to say that it is an advantage, because certainly the gentlemen of the Committee on Education and Labor showed their gallantry by voting out the bill which had my name on it, and, as the very distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, in arguing for the rule on the bill, inferred, it was due to



their kindness, to their courtesy, to the one woman member of the Committee on Education and Labor. But, this bill does have the support of many Members of the Congress. They recognize library service as a justifiable expense of the Federal Government to make available to the population of the United States ingredients for access to information. The library services perform a practical operating function in our cultural development, our economic activities, and our political and social progress.

To quote from an editorial in the *Evening Star* of May 7:

#### LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

There is really no good reason why any Americans should be cut off from public library service just because they happen to live outside of cities. The public library has been called the university of the people, and so it is—a blessing of democracy and an aid to it. The art of reading, which Bacon tells us "maketh a full man," has not, despite the magnetic distraction of television, suffered a complete decline. The sale of the classics in cheap paperback editions gives heartening evidence that the desire to match minds with the great writers of the past has not died. The tremendous popularity of the bookmobiles, which have been lumbering through rural regions as stop-gap means of distribution, attests that a large hungry clientele exists.

Tomorrow the House will consider—we trust, favorably—a bill which would bring the pleasures of book borrowing within reach of the many Americans currently deprived. The library services bill would provide a total of \$7.5 million annually for 5 years for the construction and operation of libraries in rural areas, fringe areas around large cities, and impacted areas. Previous similar measures have fallen before objections that public library service is solely the responsibility of the States and that Federal financing would lead to Federal control. H. R. 2840 meets these objections. It requires that all Federal funds must be matched by the States on an ability-to-pay formula and makes specific provision that the administration of the program be put in the hands of each of the States' library extension agency.

H. R. 2840 has the bipartisan sponsorship of 27 Representatives and 16 Senators. Its chief sponsor, the American Library Association, is hopeful of its passage. The House would do well to approve the bill and thus bring to everyone the instruction, diversion, and solace which books incomparably offer.

The *New York Times*, in an editorial on May 5, gave support to this particular legislation:

#### LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

The library services bill is now before the House. The list of sponsors is bipartisan.

This bill would grant a total of \$7,500,000 a year for 5 years to States matching the grants. The objective is to bring books and other library services to rural families who have none at all, and to improve library services for an additional 53 million Americans whose libraries are inadequate. The States and localities will have complete authority under the program established by the bill.

In the great cities we are accustomed to impressive library service. Our cousins in the villages and on the farms are entitled to it too. This legislation would stimulate the extension services of the various States and the regional cooperative services based on metropolitan centers. The funds proposed are modest, the period limited. It is believed that local communities in rural areas, having tasted the advantages of good

libraries, would then wish to continue the services with local and State funds.

The free public library is a vital symbol of educational opportunity and it is to be hoped that Congress will pass H. R. 2840.

Besides the very large number of Representatives and Senators sponsoring this legislation, Senators and Representatives coming from 22 different States, it also has found wide support from groups across the country. My colleague from Oregon a moment ago inferred that the American Library Association was the only organization which was giving this bill wide support. And yet we find that there are a great many nationwide organizations, exceptionally fine organizations, which, after careful study, have endorsed this bill:

The American Association of University Women.

The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The American Veterans.

The Association for Childhood Education.

The General Federation of Womens Clubs.

The International Association of Machinists.

The National Council of Chief State School Officers.

The National Council of Teachers of English.

The National Education Association.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

The National Farmers Union.

The National Grange.

The United Auto Workers.

The Catholic Library Association.

The Council of National Library Associations.

With these groups endorsing it, I fail to see how anyone could say that it does not have support from the people of this country. Inadequate library service—and in thousands of communities there is a complete lack of it—is much more than a rural problem. The testimony before the committee was that there are today 27 million Americans without access to modern library facilities.

I ask you, Can we afford to continue under this condition? We are providing library services abroad, recognizing the very vital importance of having informed people.

Again, as the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], in arguing for the rule, said, the appropriations requested for the fiscal year 1957 for the Overseas Information Service—that is, the libraries—is \$14,700,000. Can we not then afford to spend \$7½ million to assist the States in extending public-library services to the rural areas in our own country?

The Department of Defense is asking this year for over \$1½ billion to develop better weapons. Is it unreasonable then to ask that at the same time we spend \$7½ million for aid to libraries in rural areas? What better weapon can we have in a struggle based on science, technology—and above all on ideas—than educated minds? Books for the education of our young people are as much our strength in time of war as is armament

for tanks and planes. And the best evidence of the truth of that is the fact that since the war in Korea over three-fourths of a million young Americans have been rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiencies. That is an appalling waste of resources for defense, and it is even a more appalling commentary on our educational neglect. It seems to me it is an unanswerable argument for the need for this particular bill.

We spend \$30 million a year on the Selective Service System—\$30 million a year to draft young men. Can we not then spend one-fourth that much to give them books to read?

Is a nation that spends \$5,250,000,000 for tobacco, \$8,830,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, \$1,472,000,000 for cosmetics and other toilet articles, \$1,275,000,000 for movies—is a nation that spends this much on these items too poor and too short-sighted to spend \$7½ million for library services in the rural areas—in the 404 counties—in this country that today do not have any library services at all? Last year it was estimated that the American people spent \$200 million for chewing gum.

May I point out that the per capita cost of this bill, if it is passed, is 5 cents, the cost of one package of chewing gum? Surely it is well worth 5 cents to every man, woman, and child in this country to extend library services to the rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago a statement was made that undue pressure has been brought by a certain organization to write letters and editorials to Congressmen. I should like to read a telegram which I received from the Republican Governor of my State. I am sure my colleague from Oregon would agree that he would not be subject to undue pressure. And the Governor wires me:

The library services bills, H. R. 2840 and Senate bill 205, scheduled for vote May 8, is, in my opinion, of public interest to the State of Oregon. The Oregon State Library Board and Oregon Library Association, in whom I have confidence, assisted by many librarians in the State, have studied the needs of Oregon libraries over a period of years, and they advise me that the funds provided by this bill will stimulate the improvement of local services. Within the 5-year period specified in this bill adequate demonstrations could be provided. May I urge your support for this bill?

ELMO SMITH,  
Governor of Oregon.

The enthusiasm and support from all parts of the country for the library services bill has been very great.

May I also read a telegram from the Oregon Library Association:

APRIL 28, 1956.

EDITH GREEN,

House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Library services bill resolution Oregon Library Association:

"Whereas in our modern and highly complex society it is being increasingly demonstrated that knowledge is power; and

"Whereas major governments of all political philosophies are avidly in pursuit of knowledge particularly in technical and scientific fields; and

"Whereas a true democracy such as ours which is governed by all of the people, must have an informed and intelligent citizenry if it is to meet the challenge of totalitarian

philosophies and maintain ascendancy in world civilization; and

"Whereas as long as our people are informed they will not be led astray by demagogues waiting and ready to exploit the credulous and ill informed but will instead be prepared for intelligent fruitful and effective living in an increasingly complex world; and

"Whereas the free public library has proven itself to be America's best agency for impartially diffusing knowledge and dispensing information to all the people; and

"Whereas the library facilities of our country are unequal and spotty with 27 million of our citizens without access to local public library service of any kind; and

"Whereas the inequality of local free library service is particularly evident in the State of Oregon with 343,000 of our people entirely without public library service; and

"Whereas many citizen groups of Oregon have long labored and are now working hard to correct these inequalities; and

"Whereas the library services bill, House bill 2840, and its companion bill in the Senate, Senate bill 205, now pending in Congress are designed particularly to assist each State in providing local library facilities to unserved rural areas; and

"Whereas there are many rural areas in Oregon which could be brought good library service through the assistance provided by the library services bill; Be it therefore

*"Resolved, That the Oregon Library Association in convention assembled in Salem, Ore., on April 27, 1956, warmly endorses the library services bill and that it urges every Representative and Senator from Oregon to work in behalf of this bill and vote for its passage; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the association and that copies be sent by wire to all Congressmen from Oregon."*

OREGON LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,

CARL HINTZ,

*President, Librarian, University of Oregon, Eugene.*

HENRY T. DRENNAN,

*Vice President and President-elect, Librarian, Umatilla County Library, Pendleton.*

MARJORIE POMEROY,

*Secretary, Librarian, Malheur County Library, Ontario.*

THOMAS H. CAHALAN,

*Treasurer, Librarian, University of Oregon Dental School, Portland.*

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion it seems to me that for this amount of money, \$7½ million—5 cents per capita, never in any other way could we give so much to so many for so little.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if the number of books made available to our people is the measure of the education they have, then indeed the 16th President of the United States should have been a very ignorant man.

I have had the pleasure and the honor of serving on the Committee on Education many years ago under the able leadership and generalship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], whom I have always greatly admired.

On the 5th of March 1923, here in the city of Washington it was my pleasure to be visiting with Robert Todd Lincoln, the son of Abraham Lincoln. I asked

him this question: "What became of your father's library?" He answered, and said, "My father did not have a library. When he died he left less than a dozen books. One was the Bible, which lay upon his desk all the while he was President. Two were treatises on slavery. The other 6 or 7 were books on history and government, given to him by some friends."

Imagine, one of the world's great men, who died with a library of less than a dozen books.

I am greatly interested in this bill. I have always been for education, I am for it now, and certainly I could not bring myself to be opposed to the bill before the House.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I think we would all be defeated if we tried to argue against libraries as a reason for voting against this bill. Imagine the position of a Congressman in a campaign year arguing against children or motherhood—you might just as well take any one of these as to argue against libraries. I have been in the Congress for 12 years hoping that we would find a case sometime small enough and insignificant enough in amount where we might vote against the further encroachment of the Federal Government in the redistribution of wealth and in the socializing of our economy. I doubt if we can stop the process in Congress, or by the voting process at all. When we are confronted with the fact here that the great Governor of the State of Texas is under such a prod, as shown in the letter circulated to the membership of Congress by the Library Association, even Congressmen and Governors cast their votes for the library bill. They have been developing that technique, like any other professional group, for the last 25 years. If we cannot stop at some place, we certainly cannot reverse the trend. We know that. The corn boys, you remember, tried to throw peanuts out of the feed trough so as to give a starting place there to reverse the Federal-aid subsidies program. Before the Members from Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Texas got through, the corn boys were almost shamed out of the House—talking about peanuts not being a basic commodity like corn. Indeed, peanuts, they said, were sort of indigestible, anyway, so we ought to have been able to start with peanuts to reverse the trend, to reestablish the so-called free economy.

So I am going to argue here purely on the basis of principle. I am not going to argue about libraries as such. I am going to argue about the politics of it—the responsibility of it—the utter futility of the mechanistic, materialistic approaches to improving our morals and our education by Federal bureaucracy. We are no longer free as Congressmen or Governors when the Federal Government gets into the business of subjecting itself to political voting and to campaigns to decide whether we are going to vote for or against such things as a library.

While my friend the gentleman from North Carolina and I think the gentleman from Georgia halfway promised—at least, they indicated—if we would just

get ourselves started to doing right in the States by the Federal intervention programs, that then we might look forward to the stoppage of this Federal interference. Now you do not even have to argue that. Our foreign affairs and our foreign-aid program started off with about as much of a promise as any piece of legislation ever did. It looks like it is going to be one of our most permanent pieces of legislation, and I can imagine that this will be another one on the list.

One of the most objectionable features of these Federal-aid programs—and they are all the same, whether they be for corn or wheat or cotton or powerplants or subsidized houses or Federal aid to education or libraries or foreign aid—you come up with six of our industrial States being forced, under compulsion of the sheriff, if you please, to provide 57 percent of the proceeds to be distributed according to the judgment of the United States commissar. He must decide between the counties that are going to get the benefit or the school-rooms that are going to be added—and he is the absolute judge; there is no appeal from him.

I wish the Members might weep with me once over what happens in New York State. I am sure you would if you could appreciate the fact that the per capita income of New York State is falling behind in rates of increase of all the 11 Southeastern States. They will get most of the proceeds of this bill. New York State pays 18.7 percent of all the taxes that are paid, whether Federal aid or not. Under this bill, it will give up \$1,409,000, and, if it wants to get back any of the proceeds of this bill, it must put up matching funds of \$425,000 more, or a total of \$1,834,000 to get back \$249,000 for libraries. We have to give up \$6 for every \$1 we get back. You may give a quick answer and say New York State does not need libraries and does not need to take any of this money. That brings up another point. When Washington begins to administer the number of classrooms in 59,000 school districts, or the number of libraries that 661 counties need, what formula, what rule of sense do we work out? Of course there can be no formula. The districts are in various stages of development. Some have enough libraries. Some have enough classrooms. They ought not be penalized as this bill does and as every Federal-aid bill penalizes every State that is doing its job and paying for its libraries. Then witness the fact as they look across one State border to another where they have delayed or neglected to do the job. They may have had their ears to the ground as to when the Federal Government was coming along to do the job. New York State and the other five industrial States pay for their own, and then pay for the others that are just as well off as they are. Indeed the testimony before our committee shows that there is no State in this Union less able to take care of its own libraries and its own classrooms than the Federal Government itself.

I do not think it is any argument to speak of wastage and ineffectiveness, and the enemies we have made abroad by our foreign-aid programs, supporting their



Socialist parties that we have helped to finance. That is an argument why we should support the same kind of programs at home that send our boys abroad armed to prevent war there. What is the difference between our processes of federalizing any part of our country and the process of giving foreign aid to socialize any part of foreign countries? Indeed, the parties in power, generally speaking, are Socialist or Communist even after we get through pouring billions of dollars into their economy. There is about the same situation in France and Italy today that we had when we started, for example.

So, how do you expect the Federal Government to bring about any different results if it attempts to impose the Government's own concept of what libraries should be and who should have them? Do you not think the United States Office of Education will literally control the books and the thoughts of counties into which they carry these books? The Federal Government is to buy books. Do you think the Federal Government is going to ignore its responsibility to the taxpayers completely by saying nothing about the quality of the books that are to be selected by these libraries?

We have in the United States Office of Education the greatest authority on books and libraries in the world, I suppose. All of the folks back home who are wise at all go to her to get their ideas on the selection of books.

It is not a compulsory matter, it is just a matter of thought control by the very power and size and influence of the Federal Government over our thought and our economy. It is in the nature of things when you build up a great bureaucracy in Washington that the bureaucracy holds conferences and conventions and gives of its own wisdom to every library association in the country. And so it is true of our schools and our other parts of our economy.

One reason I would like to see us stop at this point in this whole Federal subsidizing process is that when you subsidize or socialize—if we were more advanced I think we would have to use the word "socialize"—you must socialize all areas related to it. Let me illustrate out of one experience: When you socialize corn, for example, or subsidize it, then that corn becomes the property of the United States of America in exactly the same way as corn becomes the property of the U. S. S. R.; it is Government-owned property; private ownership is out. When you socialize that area called corn, you must inevitably thereafter socialize all other areas relating to corn. We have to socialize pork, cows, eggs, chickens. You cannot live in a socialized market area with regard to corn and sell your products in a free market while the very thing the animals live on is socialized at a fixed price. So when you socialize education you cannot stop. There is not a Congressman here who thinks we can stop if enough votes are organized to get behind any project of any kind in this country. When you socialize corn and libraries where would you stop? If you socialize houses where will you stop? Congress must consider.

Our States that are losing out in this process are down in their rate of per capita income. It is falling 20 points below the national average and sixty-odd points below the lowest groups in these United States.

So let us stop even if it has to do with libraries, this cost, this cancer, that must go on and on until we are the Socialist Party, not the free.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody can seriously quarrel with the concept of adult education; I do not think anybody can seriously quarrel with the concept of providing books for school children. It seems to me that the main difference of opinion here today is the manner of accomplishing this. There is fear, on the part of some Members, that this is another step toward socialization. There is some fear on the part of Members that this is a step toward the control of the minds of the young people and the adults by Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this program is aimed completely at getting library services off the ground. There is, to my mind, nothing sinister in this program. This is a program which lasts for 5 years and includes matching of funds. In other words, the States have to match the Federal funds on a formula set forth in the bill. We have adopted this concept in many other fields: vocational education, vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, to name two. In these, the Federal Government has stepped into a program in order to get it off the ground, and to get the States and local governments to assume responsibilities which had not prior to that time been assumed by them. I intend to support this bill; I am for it. However, I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to section 7 of this bill, which provides that in the event the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare decides that a State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements or if there is a failure to substantially comply, the Secretary may then withhold further payments under this act.

I note that there is no provision for appeal of a unilateral decision made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in this particular field. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if that is so intended.

Mr. BARDEN. I may say to the gentleman that normally I share the precautions that he has in matters of this kind.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman and I share a great many things in common.

Mr. BARDEN. I have great respect for the gentleman's legal mind. Let me say in this withholding provision, section 7, it states "failure to comply substantially with the provisions required to be included in the plan." Now that ties directly to section 5 which writes into the bill the very clear-cut provisions which he must find have been substantially vio-

lated. I do not know how you could better safeguard that than by making provision for court review.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I notice in section 5 (a) (4) there is provided a report by the State library administrative agency to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require. Presumably, if this report was not made or it did not include such information, whether it might be important or not, section 7 could then apply and the Secretary could withhold funds which otherwise would go to the State under the provisions of this act. Is that the gentleman's interpretation?

Mr. BARDEN. I will be honest with the gentleman. I have never liked that provision in any law that has gone through this House; yet it has been written many, many times into legislation.

There should be some kind of an arrangement whereby the information would be made available to the Commissioner in order that he could then function properly as the United States Commissioner of Education was intended to function—that is to disseminate information throughout the United States in order that others may profit by mistakes made by those involved in this kind of program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I might ask the distinguished chairman of the committee one further question, it is my understanding since the term "rural area" does not include an incorporated or unincorporated town having a population of more than 10,000 persons, that any incorporated or unincorporated town having a population of less than 10,000 is included under the provisions of this bill and is eligible for aid under the provisions of this bill as it is now written; is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is correct. I might say to the gentleman that my eye hit that the first thing when I was looking at the draft. You have the correct interpretation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I ask the gentleman a further question? Would that include the building of buildings in a town or city?

Mr. BARDEN. No. There is a provision in here that prohibits real-estate transactions, the buying of land and the building of buildings.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the proceeds cannot be used for the purchase of real estate but can only be used to employ personnel, and to purchase books and book-mobiles.

Mr. BARDEN. May I read this:

No portion of any money paid to a State under this act shall be applied directly or indirectly to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings or for the purchase of any land.

That covers it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the chairman.

I think this is a little bit different situation than many of the situations in which we have adopted sections such as 5-4 (a) and section 7, and I plan at the proper time to offer amendments to amend both of them.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have this privilege of speaking in behalf of this bill.

I have been interested in this library services bill for many years now. Our Committee on Education and Labor has talked about it, and studied it, and investigated it, and held hearings on it, over a period of years, until I now believe the bill has fewer shortcomings than almost any bill that I have had the experience of knowing about in the years since I have been a Member of the Congress.

There are definite safeguards in this bill. They are sufficient, I will say, to satisfy those who are inclined to be most careful. It is a bill that adequately preserves and protects the rights of the States and local communities.

The need for this legislation is great. The demand for the services which this bill will stimulate and aid the States and local communities to render is great.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible for every Member of this House to have had the experience I had on April 13, 1955. On that day I traveled with the bookmobile of the Cullman-Winston Regional Library, across Winston County, Ala., to carry books to the tens of stops that were on that day's schedule. This bookmobile had been brought about largely because of the work of the women's groups in the two counties. The home demonstration clubs and other women's clubs had worked unceasingly to promote the bookmobile and the services it could render to the rural people of the area. It was for me an inspiring experience as we traveled about over that county; and as we stopped and brought books to the people who desired them, I wondered why as a Nation we had waited so long to bring that system of library service within the reach of every citizen. One stop was by the roadside, with no residence or store in sight; yet almost as soon as the bookmobile stopped beside a path leading up a steep railroad bank, 6 or 8 people with armloads of books appeared at the top of the way, including stores and schools and small towns and individual points or stations, where people would return books and pick up new books for their reading. We were accompanied on this day with the bookmobile by Mrs. Beulah Howle, the efficient librarian of the bookmobile, and by Miss Evelyn Day Mullen, director of the public library service division of the State of Alabama. Both were inspired by the possibilities of the bookmobile program for rural areas.

The people in counties like Cullman and Winston, in Alabama, have, by hard work, led the way, in showing that bookmobile service is practical. If we pass this bill, providing the small amount of \$7½ million per year for 5 years, I want to hazard the prediction that at the end of the 5-year period the system of rendering library services by bookmobile will have spread all the way across rural America. The passage of this bill will be one of the finest actions that this Congress can take during this session.

I want to take this occasion to commend those members of the committee who have been actively interested in this matter. You have heard the eloquent statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], who performed a great service as chairman of the subcommittee which considered and reported this bill. He represents a rural area in Georgia, just as I do in Alabama, and he knows the need for this type of legislation. You also have heard the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], who has made such a great record in the field of legislation pertaining to vocational education. He gives this bill the full weight of his influence and leadership. The lady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], whose name this bill bears, has worked unceasingly for its passage since she came to Congress. She has very ably pointed out this afternoon that this bill will cost each American citizen, each year it is in operation, the cost of a 5-cent pack of chewing gum. There are many others whose names I would like to mention. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], and the host of twenty-odd ladies and gentlemen from both sides of the aisle who introduced a bill on this subject, and many others are entitled to the thanks of the country for the service they have rendered in promoting this bill to provide better libraries for all America.

The bill properly leaves to the State library agency in each State the duty of formulating all plans for this library program. Something has been said here this afternoon that indicates that some Member might have felt that the bill allows the selection of books to be made by the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the selection of the books under this bill will be by the State and local library agencies. The direction of the demonstrations, in short, the complete execution of the program, will be by the State and local agencies. That is as it should be.

Someone has said that life's first danger is an empty mind. In answer to that we may be too prone to say in America that we live in the strongest nation on earth. We say oftentimes we are building houses at the fastest rate they have been built in history. And if we are pressed a little bit, we say that we own more automobiles than any nation on the face of the earth. We have conquered the airways. We have broken the sound barrier. We have cracked the atom. But I want to say to you that we must not forget that man builds no structure, however ably he may build, that outlives a book.

This bill will bring the opportunity for the greater use of books to the people of all America and to the people of the rural areas where the need is greatest.

I was impressed very much with what Gen. William F. Dean said not so long ago in General Dean's story. He said:

I read anything they'd let me read. I was interested in finding out what modern communism was all about. You can't fight some-

thing intelligently unless you know what it is. In the United States we can't afford to be so ignorant.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States we cannot afford not to pass this bill and bring its benefits to our citizens who do not now have public library services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in urging the House to adopt the library services bill, of which I am very proud to be a cosponsor. This legislation ranks as of relatively minor importance in the overall congressional schedule, but I think it may in the future take rank as one of the most important acts of the 84th Congress if we write this bill into law.

Two questions are fundamental regarding the library services bill: Do the States need it? Will they use it wisely? Only in the answer to these two basic considerations can be found the right course to take on this question of helping to provide rural library service.

Mississippi provides, as do many other States, a positive and clear-cut answer to both these questions.

Do they need it? Mississippi has more than a million people without public library service of any kind. They are almost literally people without books. In thousands of rural homes there still, even in this day of profusion of printed information, are not even newspapers and magazines, much less good books to read. But these deplorable facts alone would not answer the question, "Do they need it?" unless it can be established that they want library service and that they are making any efforts themselves at home to get it. In 1949 a total of \$330,000 was spent for local public library service in the entire State; increasing steadily, by 1955, that total had risen to \$768,000. This is the same percentage of increase as the growth in the State's wealth and income. Clearly there is indicated that with the people's ability to pay comes their willingness to spend their money for books and libraries. Mississippi libraries are operating bookmobiles on the absolutely unbelievable sum of 30 cents per capita per year. True, it is not what anyone would call good public library service, but it is the best they can do and they are doing it. That is basic. In 15 of the State's completely rural counties not even that much can be raised locally, and it is in these counties that help would be the difference between books to read and a recourse to the trash and filth of the newsstand.

Will they use it wisely? People have not waited for the Federal Government to push them into planning for public library development. Far from it. In Mississippi in 1947 a concentrated effort by several different agencies and groups



took a long, hard look at their conditions and by means of a survey determined what direction sound library development should take. Since then a large number of people have been working tirelessly to implement the recommendations of this survey.

Several basic principles that are involved in the program that is now unfolding in my State are identical with the ones that will determine whether the money available under this bill will be spent effectively and wisely.

In the first place, larger administrative units are being set up so that every cent of unnecessary overhead will be eliminated. The need is for books, not administrative redtape. Already all public libraries in the State, with three exceptions, have been brought into countywide areas of administration. In six instances, several counties have joined together to support what is known as multicounty libraries. These mean more places for people to get books and less expensive technical processing, bookkeeping, and so forth. It means that the large pool of books assembled under cooperative measures will be available to more and more people, and that they can be moved from one place to another with economy and speed to insure a fresh collection of books in each little village at each new bookmobile stop.

In the second place, nobody gets any benefit from any outside money until he has done the best he can for himself. There are no handouts in Mississippi libraries. Even when the State has only \$500 to help a county, it refuses to do so until that county has made its maximum effort, set up its operation to insure maximum returns, and established itself along clearcut legal lines within the framework of the law. "The Lord helps them that helps themselves." And the library funds look in that direction for guidance. Members of the United States Congress need have no fear that a group of Mississippians who are not willing to do what they can for themselves will get any money from this source. There will be so little of it that, rather than being some sort of bonanza, it will be necessary to examine every cent of it with extreme care to make sure that it fulfills its purpose. The citizens of Mississippi who have worked so long and so hard for their libraries under unbelievable odds of poverty and who want to extend their services to their poorer neighbors but cannot now do so will see that only the deserving get the funds. That discipline will be taken care of at home, without doubt.

The third and final principle upon which current library development is taking place, and upon which any further increase will be based, is that unless there is some chance for future continuation, no help is forthcoming. The road must be clear ahead before anything is set up. What will happen when this money is gone? Every cent that goes into Mississippi libraries from any source gets the searchlight of that question. It is an investment, not an expenditure. It is a foundation stone, not a firewall.

The people know of the terminal phase of this legislation. Already their plans have been laid with that in mind. They

have known that what State aid they had, small as it has of necessity been, involved the ever-present necessity of supporting themselves. With Federal funds, they face the same realistic approach.

Sound planning, local responsibility, and economical structure—these are the three principles upon which public library service is being built in Mississippi. And whatever help comes to the State from these funds will continue to be administered by these identical principles.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be no opposition to the passage of H. R. 2840, the rural library services bill. In this country where we have the highest educational standards in the world, no one should be deprived of library service. It is in the national interest for every citizen to have access to good reading material.

We in the sparsely settled West are especially interested. South Dakota, together with the neighboring States of North Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska and others in the Great Plains region, through its historical development has a tradition of pioneering. The people of South Dakota with their courage, resourcefulness and the spirit of the early pioneer have striven to develop the educational and cultural background of the State through the organization of small community libraries. Many of the small public libraries have been so successful that the municipalities through due process of law have assumed the full responsibility for the library so that the residents within the legal boundaries of the municipalities may have the privilege of obtaining books and other material necessary for an intelligent understanding and solution of State, National and international problems which affect each individual.

South Dakota has made progress. However, although the progress in the development of libraries has been steady and strong, it has not kept pace with our modern civilization with its scientific advances and a world where distances have shrunk. The individual citizen must more and more participate in the intelligent solution of these problems if our freedom and the American way of life is to be preserved. Hence, the need for Federal funds to assist the State and the other States in the Great Plains region in developing a pattern of library service which will be peculiar to the area and geared to informing and educating the citizens in the current problems of a rapidly changing world.

Today 53½ percent of the population of South Dakota or 345,490 people are without public library service. Of the 87 public libraries which offer library service to the 47.7 percent of the people of South Dakota, or 304,539 of the population none of the public libraries with

the exception of 3, offer a service adequate to meet the American Library Association standards or the needs of the people. The expenditures per capita for library service in South Dakota during 1954 was 56 cents per capita. The minimum standard of per capita expenditures for library service as developed by the American Library Association is \$1.50. The per capita number of books recommended for book collections in public libraries is based on the population served. At least 2 volumes per capita should be available for the people in our small communities with no library having book collections of less than 6,000 volumes. With the exception of the libraries in the larger communities—Sioux Falls, Rapid City, Aberdeen, Watertown, Huron, Mitchell, Yankton, Brookings, Milbank, Mobridge, Webster, Madison—most of the libraries have far less than the minimum number of 6,000 volumes. The number of current books purchased by the same libraries is inadequate. In fact, the State Library on its 1953-54 appropriation was able to purchase only 1 new book for every 125 people without library service.

South Dakota is a State which is entering a new phase of development. Heretofore, it has been basically an agricultural State with its denser population in the eastern part of the State, small ranches in the central part of the State, and very large ranches in the western part of the State.

With the development of the Missouri River and the construction of the Fort Randall and Oahe Dams, a new source of power is available not only to South Dakota but to the other States in the area which will influence their future. The availability of power will tend to attract industries within the State which, in turn, will necessitate a change in the pattern of community life with its attendant growth of population. This will call for more modern educational institutions, one of which is the public library.

The money which the library services bill makes available to the several States, together with the provision that each State make a plan for library development peculiar to its own State, is particularly important and needed in South Dakota, since such funds are not available from the State.

The western half of our State with its sparse population and small assessed valuations is a section which needs particular study in the development of library service. This area is generally known as the ranch area with the exception of our scenic Black Hills. In this section of the State, which is my district, there is a total population of 158,147 people. Over 60 percent of these people do not have public-library service. In this congressional district there are 23 counties, 13 of which are without any public libraries. Three of the counties in this area have countywide library service. Only one of the public libraries—Rapid City—in my congressional district meets the American Library Association standards.

The rural people of South Dakota are eager to be informed as evidenced by

the cooperation which they give the Extension Service with its various adult-education programs and the public schools to which they send their children. The eagerness with which they read the books on the Reading in the Home list, which is compiled by the State library and distributed by the Extension Service, is proof of their desire for information not only on homemaking and agricultural problems but also State, national, and international problems. It is to meet the needs of our rural people that programs such as contemplated in the library services bill are needed. Our President, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, said:

To the intellectual development of our citizens—and thus, to their ability to participate in the activities of this Republic—few habits are more important than reading.

I submit the following facts for your information and for the RECORD:

South Dakota has 68 counties; 4 unorganized counties; 17 counties in South Dakota without public libraries; 7 county libraries in South Dakota.

Total population in South Dakota, 650,029; population without library service, 345,490; percent without library service, 53.3.

Twenty-three counties in South Dakota in my district; 13 counties in the district without public libraries; 6 counties in the district with 1 public library; 1 county in the district with 2 public libraries; 3 counties in the district with county libraries.

Total population of the district, 158,147; population without library service, 94,800; percent without library service, 60.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in yesterday's edition of the Washington (D. C.) Star, as follows:

#### LIBRARY-SERVICES BILL

There is really no good reason why any Americans should be cut off from public-library service just because they happen to live outside of cities. The public library has been called the university of the people and so it is—a blessing of democracy and an aid to it. The art of reading, which Bacon tells us "maketh a full man," has not, despite the magnetic distraction of television, suffered a complete decline. The sale of the classics in cheap paperback editions gives heartening evidence that the desire to match minds with the great writers of the past has not died. The tremendous popularity of the bookmobiles, which have been lumbering through rural regions as stopgap means of distribution, attests that a large hungry clientele exists.

Tomorrow the House will consider—we trust, favorably—a bill which would bring the pleasures of book borrowing within reach of the many Americans currently deprived. The library-services bill would provide a total of \$7.5 million annually for 5 years for the construction and operation of libraries in rural areas, fringe areas around large cities and impacted areas. Previous similar measures have fallen before objections that public-library service is solely the responsibility of the States and that Federal financing would lead to Federal control. H. R. 2840 meets these objections. It requires that all Federal funds must be matched by the States on an ability-to-pay formula and makes specific provision that the administration of the program be put in the hands of each of the States' library extension agency.

H. R. 2840 has the bipartisan sponsorship of 27 representatives and 16 Senators. Its chief sponsor, the American Library Association, is hopeful of its passage. The House would do well to approve the bill and thus bring to everyone the instruction, diversion, and solace which books incomparably offer.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Young] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity of commending the Education and Labor Committee for their work in bringing forth this legislation. Its enactment by Congress will do much to further education and develop better citizens in areas not now receiving adequate library services. I would like to take just a few minutes Mr. Chairman to show how this bill will benefit districts such as I represent.

According to statistics released by the Bureau of the Census, Nevada is the fastest growing State in the Nation. The population increase since 1950 has been 31 percent. Interest in education is growing as fast as our population. A little over a year ago we had a statewide survey of our public schools, and since that time we have completely revised our thinking on taxation in order to improve our public-school system. Our State university has almost doubled its enrollment in the past 3 years. Adult classes in high schools and university extension classes have increased. And interest in libraries and demands upon their services have increased mightily in the past 4 years.

Nevada people have made greater demands on their libraries, particularly in rural areas, than ever before. None of the libraries have been able to meet these demands satisfactorily. Most of them have that common handicap—insufficient funds. But probably they have a worse case of it than many other public agencies. A small population and long distances in Nevada have provided us with cities and counties with populations too small and tax bases too narrow to support good libraries. As a result, the county library in my home county has operated for 18 years without purchasing a single book with county funds. In 1954 the Tonopah City Library spent a total of \$8.95 for books. Another city library that same year spent \$44.11, and a county library at the same time had only \$42.45 for books in a year's time.

These problems have set Nevada people in search of an economical and practical way of giving library service. The people at our State library have conferred with the Nevada Library Association, local government leaders, and with interested citizens on this problem. They have what is considered a good, practical plan for overcoming some of these difficulties.

All this was done because of Nevada's interest in education, and a conviction that the public library makes a vital contribution to the educational level of our State. Cities have supported libraries for well over a century. Libraries are

needed as badly in rural areas as they are in cities. Nevada does not have second-class citizens, the people living in our rural areas are the backbone of our State. We cannot afford to neglect educational opportunities in our rural areas. In this way Nevada is not very different from the other States: People, and the welfare of our country, are our primary concerns.

The future of this Nation is directly dependent upon the integrity and worth of each individual citizen. The development of the potential of each man and woman of our State and Nation is of immediate concern to each of us. Government in the United States, unlike that in totalitarian countries, depends upon the judgment of the people. We need people who think, and think straight. Schools and colleges can give the fundamental education to their students, but the successful student is the one who is able to read and think critically after he receives his last diploma.

Public libraries are centers for individual study. They provide information on all subjects, on all sides of controversial issues. They encourage self-study. They stimulate learning and discussion of vital problems. They furnish citizens with information needed on their jobs. They build better citizens.

Our military psychologists have been studying the defection of the 21 Korean prisoners of war who chose to forsake their country for communism. There is at least one answer to their weakness, educational deficiency. It is almost incomprehensible to most of us how men could make such a choice. Americans who know their country, their Government, their people, and also know the contrasts in Communist countries could not make such a choice. Again, our Nation and its very existence depends directly upon the individual citizen.

Our national average for years of school attended is now around 10. President Eisenhower has called attention to the need for better educational opportunity. The White House Conference on Education was called for these very reasons. Studies of the Soviet plans show the importance the Russian leaders are attaching to continued education. Fears have been expressed that the development of scientists in the East will outstrip the West.

Totalitarian countries have always recognized the power of education. Dictators burn libraries, and replace them with carefully prepared propaganda. The United States must build libraries.

Some have answered that books and magazines are plentiful and that libraries are becoming obsolete. The fact that propaganda is plentiful is just another important reason for libraries. There must be one free, impartial source of information to which the citizen can turn for help in evaluating this propaganda. Libraries are this place.

Nevada is acting on its problem. The tremendous problem of support and geography can be licked. We now have a plan for a statewide library service to every community and area of the State of Nevada. This plan has three important features: First, development of a strong, coordinated library collection of



books and materials in Nevada; second, use of bookmobiles manned by trained librarians to give library service to areas of the State now without libraries; and third, a library consultant who can teach untrained librarians while they are on the job.

This plan can provide an economical, yet highly satisfactory, type of library service in Nevada. Even if Nevada's small communities had unlimited funds for books and library service it would not be sensible for any one small city to buy all the books it needs. Towns like Pioche and Beatty need access to the advantages of a huge library system such as that in the city of New York, but do not need the library in their backyards. This plan will make books available to citizens through their local public libraries and through bookmobiles.

Many of our small communities have libraries manned by untrained librarians who need the help of a library consultant who can work with them on their problems of book selection, library administration, and services to readers. A library consultant can help these people make their libraries more efficient and enable them to give their readers better service.

Nevada is not sitting back waiting for Federal handouts to libraries. Each year small progress is made on achieving this program. Legislative appropriations to the State Library extension service have more than doubled since 1953. But we are still a long way from even barest library service in most of our rural communities. We lack the books, the bookmobiles, and the library consultant we need. The library services bill will stimulate library development during its 5 years. We are for the library services bill because it is terminal legislation. We know that library service is important enough in Nevada, and in other States, that once it is demonstrated through the library services bill it will be continued by the people of Nevada and by the voters of other States through State legislation and local appropriation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this bill which is designed to promote the development of public-library service in rural areas. The committee should be commended for bringing this bill to the House.

The benefits of an abundant supply of books to the reading public are incalculable. Yet, though most of our larger cities and communities have large and complete library-service systems, many rural areas are deplorably lacking in even the minimum of library service.

Because of this lack of service the people of these rural areas are deprived of what in our country should be as readily available as the food which we eat, for books are food for the mind. Through them we can absorb and understand the broad sum of information conserved by civilization.

As the report states, the purpose of the bill is to aid the States in the extension of public-library services to rural areas within the States which are now either without such services, or possess inadequate services, and thereby encourage participation of the local people in the promotion of such libraries.

Public schools are free and tax supported as a necessary function of the State in the formal education of our children, and likewise the free, tax-supported library should be considered an integral part of their broader education.

Throughout the year public libraries provide supplemental material in the general education of the child through a broader scope of material not available in basic texts. They provide adults as well with the opportunity to broaden their education. As a positive combative force against juvenile delinquency, the public library stands high, as is pointed out in the committee report.

During recent years the education level of our country has risen tremendously, and we must, through the expansion of library services, keep pace with the demand for books which that expansion stimulates.

Once again I say the committee should be commended for bringing this bill to the House, and the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] should be congratulated for her success in sponsoring this bill, and for getting it reported out so that we may vote on it before the session is too far advanced.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON].

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with H. R. 2840, the library services bill, and also read a statement by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in regard to this bill. His statement is as follows:

As one of the sponsors of this act to promote and develop library services in rural areas of our county, I wish to say that it is my firm belief that this bill is necessary, and that its provisions will make it possible for many millions of Americans, now denied the use of books and other materials provided by public libraries, to enjoy the benefits of public library service.

In my own State of Ohio, I estimate that there are at least 570,000 persons in the economically undeveloped southeast portion who have little library service, or none at all. In this area of more than 8,000 square miles there are libraries which exist on as little as 11 cents per capita, and the average support for public libraries in the area amounts to only 45 cents per capita. Since the American Library Association recommends the expenditure of \$1.50 per capita for only the barest minimum service, it is easy to see that so-called library service is impossible in the greater part of the region. Shocking as these figures are, by and large Ohio is much better off than many other States and areas in the matter of public libraries. Where the local tax return is so low that adequate support of libraries is impossible, the aid which will be given by this bill will help to stimulate the people to seek adequate aid from their States, once they have learned by demonstration what the library can give.

The library services bill is wise in its provision for limiting aid to the States to a period of 5 years, and in providing for a matching of Federal funds by the various States on a fair and workable formula. It is wise, also, in allowing the States to use the

Federal funds as they see fit, so long as the money is used to extend public library service to areas which now have none.

We have developed our schools to a high degree, and our colleges and universities are returning more and more trained and educated people to their home neighborhoods every year. These people, as well as those who have been denied higher education, desperately need public libraries as a complement to their formal schooling. An enlightened and informed public will be able to fend off and defeat the subtle insinuations of propaganda and subversion which threaten us.

Public libraries, except in some wealthy communities, have never received decent support. A good library is far less expensive to support than a school, yet its influence and power are beyond measure. Scientists, teachers, businessmen, leaders in all walks of life, as well as the housewife, the working man, and the child who is eager to learn, turn to the public library for information and inspiration.

I believe that this bill will provide benefit and pleasure to millions of Americans who now have no access to libraries, and I ask the support of all members of the House in making this bill into law.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express myself as favoring passage of H. R. 2840. I have received a great deal of correspondence from my district in favor of this legislation and pointing out the fact that its enactment would serve as a stimulus to local authorities to provide library services.

I feel that providing Federal aid to the States for the demonstration of public library services in rural areas with inadequate library facilities will bring great benefits, considering the small cost involved.

I sincerely regret that commitments in my district prevent my being on the floor when this important matter is brought up for consideration.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the House today is considering the library-services bill, H. R. 2840. I compliment the Committee on Education and Labor for the excellent work they have done on this bill. This is a measure designed to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas throughout the United States. On January 24, 1955, it was my pleasure to introduce H. R. 2860, a bill identical to the measure we are considering at the present time.

Library-service legislation has been long overdue. Library legislation was before the House of Representatives on Thursday, March 9, 1950. I voted to support the legislation at that time, and it is my hope that the measure under consideration today will be unanimously approved by the House.

This legislation is greatly needed in order to make available local public-library service to the approximately 27

million Americans who do not now have the opportunity to avail themselves of such service. It should be noted that along with these 27 million there are about 53 million more of our people who receive inadequate public-library service. Library service is one of the prime essentials in a democracy, and we should certainly do all we possibly can to make it available to our people.

This legislation is intended to stimulate greater interest in and support of public-library service by State and local governments. In the 5-year period of the program provided for in this measure, the State library agencies will, I am sure, be able to demonstrate adequate library service with the additional funds made available under the act. This is exceedingly important, since people need to experience good library service to realize its value.

#### GOAL OF THE LEGISLATION

Because of the great lack of public library service prevailing in the rural areas of the Republic, this bill is designed to assist these areas. Under this library services bill a rural area is defined as an incorporated or unincorporated place of 10,000 population or less. In most instances, a community of 10,000 or less is unable to finance an adequate library program independently. One of the goals of the legislation now under consideration is to develop larger units of public library service drawing together a number of such communities, a whole county or even several counties in order to provide a financially strong, well-stacked and efficient library system.

A library in a city larger than 10 thousand population can be brought into the plan under the bill if that library agrees to extend its services to the surrounding rural areas. In many cases, such an urban library can become the headquarters for a larger unit of service. This development needs to be done on a large scale throughout the country and can be brought about within the 5-year program of the library services bill. Such systems will be able to carry on the service after the Federal help is withdrawn. These larger units of service will be a major solution in overcoming the public library shortage in the United States.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

The library services bill provides for the authorization of \$7,500,000 a year for 5 years. These funds are to be used by the several States in developing adequate public library service in the rural areas. The States must match the Federal funds in order to participate in the program. Each official State library agency is required to submit a plan to the United States Commissioner of Education showing how the funds will be employed. The State agency would have complete authority over the development and execution of the plan, as well as the selection of the books and other library materials and personnel.

The Commissioner of Education must approve the plan if it carries out the specifications in the bill, which requires that: Funds are to be used for public library service in rural areas; none of the money can be used for the purchase or erection of buildings or the purchase

of land; and the State cannot cut back on the funds to the State library agency below that of the year previous to the one in which the Federal funds are received.

#### STATEMENT OF HEARING

On May 25, 1955, I appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor in support of the legislation we are considering today. At that time I stated:

The proposed library services legislation is for the purpose of providing an urgently needed stimulus in the struggle to overcome a national shortage of library facilities and library services in rural areas. The proposed legislation is not intended to subsidize or to foster a control over any of the libraries in the Nation; it is to furnish the initial incentive in a long-range program. Once such services and facilities are established and once they are operating satisfactorily, it is confidently anticipated that local and widespread demand will insure their continuance long after Federal assistance has been discontinued.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE LIBRARIES

I now turn to a discussion of the library situation in my own State. New Hampshire has 239 libraries in its 236 towns. There are only 4,300 people in the State without a local public library. These libraries vary from well-supported city libraries with excellent book collections, experienced staff and progressive programs to stimulate the use of books and related materials, to tiny towns where the library is open only a few hours a week and there are only meager funds for the purchase of new books. If a library is to be effective, it must have sufficient funds to provide regular purchase of the best books for children and young people, and recreational reading, thought-provoking and informative materials on all subjects for adults.

Yet in 1955 there were 177 public libraries in my own State which did not have even \$500 for the purchase of books. Town sources for added taxes with which to improve local libraries are meager. New Hampshire has tried to help this situation. The State library has divided the State into four areas and established branch centers, with a librarian, whose special task is aiding these small libraries, in charge of each area. Each area has a bookmobile—in some cases provided by the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs—which visits libraries with regularity and loans good books to the library for relending to children and adults. In addition, the State library operates a mail-order service for these libraries, answering difficult reference questions and mailing out unusual titles.

#### PROPOSED PROGRAMS FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

Although satisfactory as far as it goes, we believe that better service can be obtained through cooperative programs. When the proposed legislation is enacted, the New Hampshire State library will immediately inaugurate several programs in an effort to demonstrate that better library service is possible. These programs will enable the State library to determine acceptable size of area, the techniques best adapted to New Hampshire and unit costs, so that legislative bodies will possess sound facts on which

to base decisions about future library service.

The demonstrations will include the development of a federation of libraries, which will work together and share services and material. Each library, while retaining its autonomy with its own board of trustees, will be a part of a group and from this unification will gain strength. The local reader will be free to use any library in the system, either close to his home, in the town where he does his shopping, or in the city library. To the librarian it will be a relief from ordering and cataloging of books, since this will be done at the central library in the system, and funds will go further since books will be bought in quantity. Librarians, by working together, will thus have an opportunity to learn more about books and library techniques.

The section of the State selected for demonstration of the advantage of the federation of libraries will take into consideration existing strong libraries, with a practical, workable, economical and efficient federation of libraries as its aim. Such a demonstration may convince our towns and our States that a unified service will be best for all our citizens.

For the small rural libraries not in a federation, the demonstration will also include strengthening a present branch office and providing better service. Aid will be given to libraries in organizing programs to encourage the use of books, including story hours for children, adult discussion groups and television and radio programs about literature. The staff and book collections of the branch office will be enlarged to provide every possible library resource for the rural libraries in the area. In a State where the majority of libraries are open only a few hours a week, there are very few libraries with experienced librarians. Therefore, it will be desirable to have librarians who are specialists in work with children, teenagers and adults available to help the part-time rural librarian. New Hampshire's plan calls for a young people's librarian, a children's librarian, a reader's adviser and an adult education specialist to assist local librarians in initiating and carrying out special services which will make libraries effective. Working under the guidance of the specialist, the librarian and library board will discover ways of using local resources and developing programs best suited to the local situation, and will become more efficient in their work.

These demonstrations of better library service will be similar, yet there will be enough variation to provide a good test of what is best for New Hampshire. The strengthening of an existing program of service by enlarging the staff and book collection of one of the State Library branch offices has wholehearted approval and support at the present time. However, a program of unification in a cooperative venture may be a stronger method of securing good library service for all. An evaluation of these two types of better library service, from both a financial and effective viewpoint, will provide information which will enable the governing bodies of the towns and the State to select a pattern best suited to New Hampshire.



There can be little doubt about the acceptance of responsibility for these programs once their value is demonstrated. Some years ago a legislature intent on economy curtailed the bookmobile work. The people of New Hampshire were quick to defend and request its restoration. Once people discover the value of good books, they are loath to lose them. By providing effective libraries, cooperative programs will be a stimulus to towns and cities, thus encouraging the use of local funds for better library service.

I am certain that you will agree with me that there is much need for this legislation throughout the United States. I am very much pleased that the New Hampshire State Librarian, Mrs. Mildred McKay, who was formerly president of the National Association of State Libraries and who appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor in support of this legislation, has made available to me the proposed programs for New Hampshire which I have just presented. Mrs. McKay has given great leadership in this work and has certainly developed excellent plans for New Hampshire.

#### WIDESPREAD BENEFITS

Again I refer to the statement I made before the committee on May 25, 1955. In closing my remarks, I used the following words:

The public library can and should be an invaluable supplement to the work of our schools. For several years the trend in elementary and secondary teaching has been to make more and more use of materials and publications outside the conventional classroom, and beyond the textbook itself. The public library is the natural haven for such requests. Adults, in turn, also find the library an indispensable storehouse of recorded information. The businessman, the farmer, the artisan, and the housewife all at one time or another find guidance and assistance in a public library. For the vast majority of adults, the library offers the only free, tax-supported opportunity to continue education where either the elementary or secondary school left off, or even to continue from where higher education may have terminated. The library in most instances, if well equipped, is willing to and capable of providing the opportunity for continuous education, self-improvement, recreation and culture. Also with reference to a compelling question of the day, only an educated and alert citizenry is competent to cope with the insidious aspects of communism and world strife. All effective means of information and education must be utilized in order for the adult to render sound judgment on current critical issues. The public library is the institution especially qualified to fill this need, more particularly, libraries in rural areas.

The legislation now under consideration will be a great stimulus to the development of better public library service in rural areas throughout the country. I hope that before the adjournment of this session of Congress, the legislation we are considering today will become law.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am vitally interested in the passage of H. R. 2870 to promote further development of public-library service in rural areas. I assisted in sponsoring similar legislation in the 81st Congress, and on January

24, 1955, introduced H. R. 2870, a companion bill to the one now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, education is made up of a number of things. We want our young people to have good schools, good teachers, and good libraries. For this reason I believe in Federal aid where it is a proven national necessity. I believe that a program of public-library services for rural areas is of utmost importance for the continuous education of the American people—as citizens, workers, and community leaders. I am in favor of Federal aid for library services in rural areas because such a program would make a significant contribution to the extension of education where it is greatly needed. This Federal-aid program, in particular, would render a service to millions of persons in the farm areas of this country.

Library-service programs in rural areas where they have been tried successfully have been wholeheartedly received and supported by the people. This is one reason why I am convinced that a program of Federal aid is important because it will stimulate local interest and support which otherwise might take years to develop.

I favor this program because it represents to me a reasonable function of the Federal Government. The Nation as well as the States should be concerned with libraries, like schools.

Increased educational attainment is a national asset just as much as it is a State and local asset. The availability of public library facilities should not be limited only to some citizens of this great Nation. The library services bill would extend much needed library resources to many more persons who really need them.

Twenty-seven million people in these great United States are without access to local public-library services of any kind. Ninety percent of this group live in rural areas entirely untouched by libraries of any kind. This bill, if enacted, would go a long way toward bringing these people books and information which they should have. Far too many rural areas in this country do not have a library program.

Because experience proves that once people have had rural library service, they find a way to continue the program—it is imperative that a Federal stimulus program be enacted to advance this service. The proposed program would be limited to 5 years. We have proof that after this period a rural library-service program is most likely to be continued through local and State support. In fact, a careful study of this problem in areas where rural-library service programs have been made discloses that the local people readily accept the responsibility for the continuation of library service to the same extent that they accepted rural electrification and the local county agent to advise them about local farming plans. The stimulation of Federal aid will greatly increase the progress toward adequate library services all over the country.

I am convinced that my esteemed colleagues will recognize the inestimable value to be gained from a rural-library-services program such as the one we have

under consideration today. Surely, we are all aware of the increased complexity of our society, of the rapid advances in technology, and the tremendous implications these bring to the future well-being of this Nation.

By comparison, we lag far, far behind in many important and necessary areas of knowledge which are vital to the Nation's welfare, nontechnical as well as technical. Our representative democracy requires more well-stocked libraries spread throughout the country. The need for adequate library services is greater now than ever before. The extreme importance of libraries to our Nation's welfare is dramatically expressed by the House committee's report on the current measure. The committee stated that:

Altogether, the public library performs a practical operating function in our educational processes, our cultural evolution, our economic activities, and our political and social development.

I am firmly convinced of the value of library services to rural areas because of the experience we have had in Kentucky. In a very short period of time the Kentucky program has proved its worthwhileness. Although it does not reach as many Kentuckians as we would like it to, the program dramatically illustrates the need for, and acceptance of, library service by thousands of the citizens of my State. The progress made by the Kentucky rural-library-services program should be given recognition. I am proud of its development.

To many outsiders, probably it has seemed that Kentucky has made itself over in giving book service to its rural people through its 102 bookmobiles. There is no doubt that great progress has been made. Before the bookmobiles were rolling over the hills of Kentucky, 80 percent of the State's rural population had no access to a public library. The little libraries which did exist in some counties were woefully inadequate. Their collections consisted mainly of a few thousand books published for the most part many years ago. Many of these books were falling apart, moldy, musty, and generally dreary looking to any potential reader. No attempt could possibly be made to have up-to-date material. Local funds for the support of these libraries have rarely exceeded a few hundred dollars each year. One of the main arguments against additional support for these libraries has been that they are not used. Naturally they are seldom used—with books that repel rather than attract readers.

What have been the experiences of bookmobiles. Since this program got underway, bookmobiles have circulated 2,813,279 books to 198,760 Kentuckians. To do this job, these mobile libraries traveled 44,849 miles, stopping regularly at 2,588 schools and 1,653 rural communities.

This bookmobile program was inspired and "put on the road" through the gargantuan efforts of a group of patriotic Americans in the Commonwealth of Kentucky headed by Mrs. Barry Bingham, of Louisville; Mrs. Paul Blazer, of Ashland; Mr. Harry W. Schacter, of Louisville; and Mr. Merle Robertson, of Louisville.

These citizens joined with the local communities and the State government of Kentucky to organize a campaign which resulted in the creation of Kentucky's bookmobile program.

How has this tremendous new service affected each county?

To answer this question I am inserting only a few excerpts of many, many observations about our Kentucky rural library services program:

#### LAUREL COUNTY

Next to getting electricity in our house this is the best thing that has ever happened to us. (A reader.)

This is an answer to prayer. (A reader.)

The eagerness with which these people await the coming of the bookmobile, the smiles on their faces, and things they say do much to compensate the librarian for her hours of driving in the cold, snow, rain, or burning sun; they make her feel that she is bringing pleasure, help, information, and perhaps a new way of life to many people. (Mrs. H. V. McClure, bookmobile librarian.)

#### JACKSON COUNTY

At first most requests from children were for funnybooks and westerns. But now what a difference. They seem to be different children altogether. After less than 2 years reading, they know what they want and how to request what they can't find. Last week a little fourth-grade boy said, "Mrs. Abrams, I don't want to be selfish, but do you have any books on old time history—like when this country was first settled?" The expressions of the children while looking for books are most amusing. "Oh, look at this," "Oh, I want this one," "Oh, I could read every one here," "This is what I've been wanting." A minister's wife remarks, "This bookmobile is a blessing to us and all the books are so good, too." More and more adults are reading and taking books home to read to preschool children. There are many requests for books on farm life, house-keeping, history, geography, maps, handicrafts, arts, plays, and games.

#### JESSAMINE COUNTY

Achievement tests given at the beginning of the school year and at the close of school showed that the reading level of most students had improved from 2 to 3 grades. We give the bookmobile full credit for this. Without these books our children would not have had the wide variety of interesting and easy books to read. Our adult reading interests seem to be increasing—more and more books are borrowed for home use when the bookmobile stops at stores in each rural community. (Mrs. Icie H. Johnson, bookmobile librarian.)

#### WOLFE COUNTY

Some of my readers live high up on mountain clearings in log houses built over a century ago by their forefathers. Other readers live in the better agricultural areas; their homes match the latest creations from the architects' drawing boards. All of these readers range in age from 4 to 74. Usually about twelve or thirteen hundred books are borrowed on each trip. The reception of the bookmobile by adults, students, and teachers has been gratifying indeed. (James L. Stewart, bookmobile librarian.)

#### ALLEN COUNTY

Teachers of the rural schools say their disciplinary problems with bright children who need more than can ordinarily be assigned to them in school have lessened considerably, because the children are happily reading.

#### OHIO COUNTY

In Ohio County we have hundreds of people without television, without movies, with no entertainment or mental stimulus what-

soever. Many of these people love to read and their bookmobile is their only source of material.

One day, near Fordsville, a man came to the bookmobile asking for a book on electric wiring. He said he had a job waiting for him if he only knew how to do some simple wiring. I had the book. He used it for 2 weeks, learned from it \* \* \* got his job.

I have one family of five which averages reading 60 books every 2 weeks.

#### ROCKCASTLE

Parents who were introduced to the bookmobile through their children are now leaving their homes and are coming to the truck to select their own books. Mothers are checking out books for their preschool children. Friends are borrowing books for people who are too old to leave their homes. Just think—2 years ago our people had no library service; this avenue of wholesome recreation and of enlightenment was not open to them. (Edna A. McKenzie, bookmobile librarian.)

#### HARRISON COUNTY

At one stop there are three elderly women who are shut-ins. They cannot get to Cynthiana. These women read 6 books each in a 2-week period. It is indeed a job for them to get bookmobile service. Other women, crippled from arthritis, borrow books from the bookmobile in wholesale lots. One family, which had come from Chicago, missed the public library from the big city more than anything else. Imagine their pleasure at the sight of the bookmobile. (Mrs. C. W. Judy, librarian and bookmobile librarian.)

#### CHRISTIAN COUNTY

One woman told me her husband had never cared for reading until he picked up one of the bookmobile books; he has been a regular reader ever since.

In the oil section of the county, the children's parents are very poor. At first they cared very little for the books. Now each child selects a book and reads it. I question them and find they are getting lots from their selections. Three of the children select books for their fathers. Their mothers can't read. The bookmobile has truly been a missionary blessing to these people. (Mrs. John H. Eades, bookmobile librarian.)

#### McCREARY COUNTY

Five people in our county have read every juvenile and adult book on the bookmobile. They have encouraged others to read and have helped them with book selections. Now, they are begging for more books. The homemakers clubs throughout the county have used the bookmobile extensively. The bookmobile is not a charitable help to the poor and needy of McCreary County, it is an educational ladder to all who desire to use it. (Mrs. Lona J. Taylor, Whitley City, Ky.)

Quite obviously the program has begun to make Kentuckians aware of what they have been missing. Years of attempting to educate people to realize their own library needs were ineffectual in comparison to the startling effects of a bookmobile. To communities starved for books, the bookmobile with its fresh, new enticing books has represented a bonanza. But we know that a bookmobile and 2,000 new books are only a beginning; that the bookmobiles without good libraries back of them can never give rural people really good library service. Bookmobiles can never carry enough nonfiction to satisfy all subject requests. They can never furnish answers to reference questions. They are only a part of a much broader system of library service—an arm, so to speak, of a public library.

Just as bookmobiles have stimulated a realization on the part of Kentucky's rural citizens of their needs for good new books, so the Library Service bill will arouse a still greater understanding of what really is needed to provide rural people with well-balanced, well-organized, well-administered library service. Few people can envision such a system. They must see it work, feel its influence, practically taste the new atmosphere it engenders before they are willing to strive for its support at local and State levels.

It is obvious that bookmobiles have gone far in Kentucky, but not far enough. The dire need for planned library systems with skillful readers' advisory services, with up-to-date collections of books on every subject, with the best reference tools, and with planned programs of adult education still exists. Only Jefferson County in Kentucky can be said to have provided adequate appropriations for public library service. Kentucky's citizens gave \$300,000 for bookmobiles; the State legislature gave over \$300,000 for books and State aid for 1954-56. The Kentucky citizens' march for books uncovered thousands of useful books. Local tax funds totaling \$217,717.69 were provided during 1955 for the support of bookmobiles and public libraries in rural areas. These facts make it clear that Kentucky is anxious to do its part, but a full realization of the total need will be possible only if the library services bill passes, giving rural citizens their first chance to see what good library service could be if only adequate funds were provided.

My close observation of the Kentucky bookmobile program leads me to be in full accord with the proposition that we vote for Federal aid to library services for rural areas. Kentucky as well as many other States in the Union needs to have its rural library program greatly expanded to provide services to the many millions of persons who are still without it.

I am sure that most of the Members of this Chamber agree to the value of public libraries and perhaps there are some who question the expenditure of Federal money for the implementation of a rural library services program. I have done some figuring on its cost and I think I have come up with some very interesting facts concerning the expenditure of \$7.5 million, which the program would authorize to be expended for each of 5 years.

I have concluded that if this program were part of our defense budget it would not be questioned. This leads me to the question—what is wrong with our value system in this country? We think nothing of paying \$6 million for a B-52 bomber. When faced with the fiscal 1957 estimate of over \$2 billion for a 1-year program to develop guided missiles we do not wince or bat an eyelash. How do you explain these figures—they are so astronomical that it becomes difficult for a person to visualize how tremendous they are. We all agree defense expenditures are necessary. Perhaps a comparison with other figures might be helpful. The library services bill, for example, would authorize \$7.5 million a



year. This is just a fraction more than it costs to build one B-52 bomber. The \$6 million it costs the Government to build one B-52 bomber does not include the cost of operation. In fact, if you add the cost of running one B-52 bomber for 1 year it would probably be as much as \$7.5 million a year.

The comparison is even more startling when we consider the \$2 billion guided missile program for 1 year. Two billion dollars at \$7.5 million a year would last for 266 years.

To give you some impression of just how long 266 years is in time—the program at the rate of \$7.5 million a year, would have started back in the year 1690 and come forward through the current year. Or if you were to spend \$7.5 million for each year in the future, against a \$2 billion total, it would take until the year 2222 to expend it all.

We can describe the cost of a \$7.5 million rural library services program in still another way—it would cost each person in the United States 4½ cents a year. Less than the cost of a bottle of soda pop—once a year.

The measure before us today deserves the serious deliberation of each Member of Congress. It proposes a 5-year program authorizing \$7.5 million a year to help the States and communities develop a rural library service program. Through the years the free world has become more and more dependent upon the distribution of information. In fact, a representative democracy depends upon the universal availability of information. Recognizing this important fact—vital to all citizens in this Nation—we must enact a program of Federal aid to rural library services.

This measure provides wide latitude for State and local initiative and inventiveness. It would definitely stimulate local interest and support. It has a simple, workable formula and a 5-year terminal date. This legislation would give the State and local communities a splendid opportunity to strengthen the entire pattern of library service throughout our Nation. I am convinced further that the investment of this small amount of Federal aid will produce many worthwhile dividends through a better organized library system and improved State financing.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the library extension service, in fact, I believe it is highly desirable, but it is a local matter. In my own district we have rural service, paid for by the taxpayers. I want to raise the point, however, that no Federal function is involved under the provisions of the bill now under consideration. For that reason it should be rejected.

It has been stressed in this debate that only a small amount of money is involved and for a limited period of time. Just as sure as I stand here when the 5-year period has expired it will be extended and the money requested will be doubled or tripled. That is the nature of Federal bureaucracy.

Is there any interstate question involved here? Absolutely no. Are not

the local communities in a position to finance this kind of program? Of course they are.

The gentleman from Alabama recited an experience. I have had similar experiences. The women in that community provided the service. Have we reached a point in this country where we take the position that Uncle Sam has got to take care of local activities in communities all over this country?

It is said that this is only \$7½ million. Over a 5-year period it is over \$37 million. It is, of course, very little money in comparison with some of our spending programs. But do not forget this bill only gets the camel's nose under the tent; this is operation "foot in the door."

What is wrong? Why cannot the local communities sponsor this highly desirable program? I will tell you why. Because local officials refuse to tax for that purpose. It is a whole lot easier to come to the Federal Government to make this soft touch, and that is what this is. It is much easier to present a case to the Congress of the United States for these funds than it is to appear before the local county board or before the local State legislature. It seems to me that those who advocate that we take Federal money when we are hopelessly in debt, \$282 billion—oh, \$37 million is chicken feed. That is true. But I say to you that the issue here is not whether this is a good idea. It is a good idea, but let the local officials tax their people for it. You are asking now that my people be taxed twice for a library service they are already supporting on the local level.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I ask the question: Is this the first move to put over Federal aid to education? I hope not.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, everybody wants adequate rural library service. I wish that every rural community in these United States might have adequate service. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the unfairness to some of our States of the means adopted by this bill to reach that objective; and the States of which I represent a part, Massachusetts, has fared ill in many of these Federal aid programs.

The amounts involved are not large, and I do not want to stress unduly the disparity between the financial benefits received by the different States and the contributions which they are called upon to make. Indeed I feel that the State of Massachusetts might be willing to accept this program even if it knew that it was unfair to that State; but I do want to point out a few figures indicating that unfairness.

I can understand that our distinguished colleague from North Carolina should favor this bill. The figures given in the committee report show that North Carolina will receive in Federal aid \$303,534 a year, while contributing \$156,366 in matched funds. The State of Massachusetts will receive about one-third of

that, namely \$111,098 a year, while it is contributing only slightly less than North Carolina, \$128,131. And Massachusetts taxpayers pay a great deal more in Federal taxes than do the taxpayers of North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I should be glad to yield if I could, but I have only 2 minutes.

Beyond that, this bill injects the Federal Government into a subject that has always been a responsibility of the States and localities. It tends to build up centralized power, and it weakens a cornerstone of American democracy, local control over local matters.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the subcommittee which has done such an outstanding job on this bill and identical bills which were introduced by others of us.

Mr. Chairman, after 2 years' study of the library services bill and of the free public library situation in my State and throughout the Union, I am convinced that this bill is both desirable and necessary and in the national interest.

The public hearings conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor during the last session and the report of this committee have established the fact that a large segment of our population is without access to free public library services of any kind. Another large segment of our people has available to them only substandard or woefully inadequate service. Certain surveys by the American Library Association place 27 million in the first category and 53 million in the second category. In other words, approximately one-half of the people in the United States now have no library service or have available to them service which is inadequate on the basis of a modest criterion established in 1948.

During that year, the American Library Association established an annual expenditure of \$1.50 per capita as essential for minimum or limited library service in a service area of 25,000 people or more. Since then, the association has revised this standard sharply upward to reflect the increased cost of personnel and management.

Ninety percent of the people without library services and a large majority of those with inadequate services live in our rural areas, defined in this bill as communities of less than 10,000 in population. Because of this fact, the library services bill is geared to our rural areas.

Despite the concentration of this library problem in our rural areas, areas completely devoid of library services and areas served by inadequate library facilities are found in all our 48 States. For example, in my State, a joint legislative commission has just completed a 2-year study of the library situation in New Jersey. It found that more than 200,000 people reside in 72 rural municipalities supporting no libraries of any kind. It also found that more than one-half of the entire population of the State live in municipalities with woefully inadequate

library facilities—most of them rural as defined in the library services bill. These conditions prevail in New Jersey in spite of the fact that New Jersey ranks among the highest States in the union in per-capita expenditure for library services.

In my district—the fourth congressional district of New Jersey—47 of the 53 incorporated municipalities are rural by definition. Serving these 53 communities are 2 county libraries and 13 municipal libraries. Only three of these municipal libraries spend as much as \$1.50 per capita per year. The median expenditure of other ten municipal libraries is only \$2.800 annually. I think that we will all agree that no decent library can be maintained at this level. Furthermore, 40 municipalities in my district have no local library facilities and must depend on the services rendered by the county libraries, which are poorly supported. One has an annual expenditure of only 23 cents per capita; the other 68 cents. And there are districts in my State that fare much worse in the availability of adequate library facilities.

I have given you this brief account of the conditions in New Jersey and in New Jersey's fourth district because, I believe, they are illustrative of the conditions to be found everywhere in the United States. In most of the other States, in fact, the evidence shows that we can expect even greater and more extended deficiencies.

These conditions patently call for additional financial support by the municipalities, the counties, the States, or the Federal Government. The recent history of the library movement in the various States shows that the local governments have been increasing their support of libraries and that the State governments have begun to accept a greater portion of this obligation to serve our people. But this progress has been slow and the amounts expended have generally been too small.

Several factors have been responsible for this failure. We are all aware of the highly competing demands for the local and State tax dollar by our schools and other local and State services. As I see it, however, there is even a more important reason: the lack of understanding and appreciation by many of our people of the value of libraries to the citizens, the community, State, and the Nation. Our rural people who have never had good library services do not appreciate what they do not know. They need to be shown the value of good library services and the effective role they can play in any community. The library services bill is designed to do just this. At the same time it recognizes that our free public libraries, as an integral and essential part of our whole plan for public education, have always been, and should continue to be, a primarily local and State responsibility.

This bill, through a modest program of grants-in-aid on a matching basis for a limited period of 5 years, would encourage and stimulate the States and their local governments to accomplish what they have generally failed to accomplish in the past—to embark on programs of library improvement in their rural areas. Through the use of these Federal grants,

matched by State and local money, they would be encouraged to set up demonstration library centers in those areas now without any library services or with poor library facilities. I firmly believe that if our people are provided for a period of 5 years with good libraries staffed by well-trained personnel dedicated to serving the people, they will never want to do without them again. I believe that when Federal funds cease after the fifth year, the States and the communities will somehow find other sources of revenue to continue the services they have learned to appreciate.

The library services bill would require each State to submit a plan of rural library improvement to the Commissioner of Education for approval. Each plan would be geared to the peculiar needs of the various States. Thereafter, the programs would be administered and supervised by the States and their subdivisions as they deem most advantageous to them.

Practically all of the States are now in a position to accept the Federal aid contemplated in this bill. A number of them have already formulated tentative programs in anticipation of its passage. I know that the State library agency in my State has devised several plans. In New Jersey, the passage of this bill might well be the spur necessary to adopt a rather ambitious program for State aid to the local and county libraries now before the legislature. Similarly, in many other States, I feel, this bill may also be the stimulus necessary to impel the initiation of broad programs of library improvements.

For these reasons, I am for the passage of the library services bill and urge you to do the same.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would be inclined to vote for the objective of this bill; I think anyone from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as evidenced by the statement in the committee report as to what Massachusetts has done, would want to support the objectives of this bill. We all want to see library services and books available to and in the hands of every individual in this country. But I am compelled to vote against the bill as I, with 163 other Members of the House, voted against a similar bill on March 9, 1950. That bill was defeated by a vote of 164 to 161.

I am compelled to this decision for one reason. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of this committee, so cogently said in the beginning of this debate, no one has suggested that a single State in this Nation cannot afford the money that is involved in this bill in order to render these services. I want to quote in the course of this debate the sound remarks, the commonsense remarks, made to the House at that time, 6 years ago last March, by a Democrat, a former colleague of ours who now is a Member of the other body and who placed this fundamental principle before us:

The true function of the National Government is to do what the people in the various States cannot do for themselves.

That is good doctrine. That is doctrine we on the Republican side of the House have advanced here repeatedly during the years. It has been supported effectively by many of our friends on the other side of this aisle. I, for one, have approved. I submit we should continue to approve it.

While I have the highest respect for those who differ from my judgment as to the wisdom of this legislation, I contend there is not a single State in this country which, if it wanted to, in the last 6 years, could not have provided these services for its people. The committee report concedes that Delaware, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island have done so.

One of the gentlemen who preceded me, referring to the 1950 proposal and to the one here today, said: "These bills are the same." They are not identical but they are the same in principle. But, at that time the argument was made that 33 million people were without these services. Today, as I understand it, the argument is that 27 million people are without those services. They should have the services, but apparently in 6 years' time 6 million additional people have been given the services. By whom? By the States and the local communities. Then where is there any reasonable basis for the argument of stimulation through Federal grants?

If this Nation is ever to become again what it was once, a strong and self-reliant country, I submit that we must return to some of the principles that President Eisenhower has been advocating for over 3 years, which I believe the people of the United States support overwhelmingly. We cannot do that if we do not insist, as we can today on this proposal, irrespective of the undoubted merits of the objectives involved, that there clearly are things the people in the several States can do for themselves far better than the Federal Government can do for them.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to endorse wholeheartedly the library services bill for which I was privileged to introduce a companion measure.

I have corresponded frequently with constituents and librarians in my district with respect to this important bill, and, without exception, they enthusiastically support it. Last fall when I was in my district, I discussed this bill with a number of librarians, and I personally visited many of the libraries we now have. I also had an opportunity to discuss this important bill with Mr. Omar Bacon, past president of the West Virginia Library Association. Mr. Bacon has been a leader in the movement to secure approval of this bill to make more information available to people in rural areas throughout the Nation.

Democracy is always predicated on the principle that people under it will know the facts. That is the only kind of a democracy that can exist. Any so-called democracy where the people are unin-



formed, where the lack of information is used as a lever to twist and warp for personal ends, and ignorance is always so manipulated, that place does not have democracy.

We in America have recognized the need for an electorate who will know the truth and have striven in many ways to insure it. We have established free public schools across our mighty land. We have guaranteed the freedom of the press and the right of assembly. We are now winning the right to read. One of our great pillars in the right of people to know is the great free public library.

The public library stands in a unique role in these perilous times. It is the one free channel of information to the adult world. It has no ax to grind, no special interest to promote. Its mission is to provide the information which a people in democracy must have to make intelligent decisions. Because it serves the adult population, it bridges the gap between the world for which we were educated and the world in which we live. In our fast-changing times, education must become a daily, constant activity.

The American public library, through its books, its magazines, its films, its records, and all its other materials, reaches the citizen on his level of ability, his speed of comprehension, his time to study. One can choose his own location and his own time. Modern mass communication media has not displaced reading, but has increased it and increased the need for it.

Today the world is locked in a deadly struggle with world communism. The struggle is for man's mind as well as his wealth. Communism's insidious tentacles weave through the fabric of American life seeking the spots of ignorance, of misery, and of tension, to destroy faith in democracy and our institutions. It professes a love of freedom while it destroys all freedom. It is a contest already a generation old and may continue for generations to come. We must be prepared to fortify our people for the long haul, the struggle without a known end.

One of the effective agencies to undermine the force of communism is the public library through its vast stores of truth. Communism's Achilles heel is its dependence on lies, deceit and deception. The playing of truth on these falsehoods erodes them like a cloud-burst on fresh turned soil. The greatest strength against communism is man's understanding of democracy and communism.

While we recognize the value of the public library in defending our way of life and in contributing to a better nation, we have not seriously enough considered its needs to do the job. We have let it grow where it developed easily—in our cities. We have not helped it in the areas beyond the cities' borders. My own State is not the saddest example, yet I am reluctant to admit that in West Virginia 56 percent of the people do not have access to a public library. There are 13 counties that have no public library in their borders. In my own district 3 counties have no public library and 2 more serve less than one-fourth of their people. Out of a total popu-

lation in my district of 247,462 persons, 92,149 have no library from which to draw books. That is 37 percent, and I come from 1 of the more urban districts of the State.

The need for public library service is a concern for all of us. The ignorance and manipulation based on ignorance is not quarantined by county lines, or confined to State borders. Its influence spreads far and wide across the Nation in our mobile population and in the decisions at the ballot box. Library service has a strong national complexion besides its local value. We must recognize this national aspect and act to insure it.

My bill before Congress, H. R. 4050, and other bills by my colleagues known as the library services bills are designed to promote library services where it is needed; namely, in the rural areas. This bill provides that the farm people will have an equal chance with urban dwellers to be well informed and equipped to participate in their civic and community duties. In my State the money will be used to develop regional libraries ranging in size from 1 to 5 counties. The West Virginia Library Commission already has a program of demonstration libraries in operation. The library services bill would expand this program and hurry the coming of libraries to the West Virginia's rural bookless areas. This money will be used as a stimulus to local initiative through leadership, initial book collections, and bookmobiles. The libraries established will become locally financed and operated units large enough to adequately provide full library service.

The library services bill provides the safeguards for the justified fears of many. It provides a terminal date of 5 years from passing for the completion of the program. It is not the beginning of a continuing Federal-aid program. Community and State leaders as well as librarians are convinced that the help over a 5-year period will reduce the problem for the States and local governments to where they can easily finish the job in this generation.

The library services bill will not be an entering wedge for Federal influence in State affairs. It clearly states and I quote from my bill:

The provisions of this act shall not be so constructed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

The States will develop their own programs which will jointly be financed from State and Federal funds. In West Virginia they will be financed by local funds as well.

Good public libraries in our rural areas is one of our pressing needs. Not only is it a serious need but it is one that can be met with a modest appropriation.

In our struggle with communism we cannot afford to neglect the great

strength that lies in an informed public. We cannot neglect our public libraries which so efficiently serve the needs of our democracy.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this legislation because nothing can do more for our country than a well-informed citizenry. This legislation is a step in that direction. I hope the bill passes unanimously.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, as the only Congressman from the State of Delaware, I am happy to give my support to this legislation which will make available to the States over the next 5 years the sum of \$7,500,000 a year to be distributed on a matching basis under the formula provided for in the act. This will make available to my State the sum of \$51,000 annually. I have been advised by the Library Commission of the State of Delaware that matching funds will be available to enable Delaware to fully participate in this program, and that the commission fully endorses this proposal. The benefits to farm and other rural families under this act will be far beyond the actual costs to the State and Federal Governments in providing ready access to books, newspapers, and magazines and other sources of information similar to such services now offered in our well-developed city library systems. Over 25 million Americans, some 90 percent of whom live on farms or in small communities, are still without access to modern library services. More than 400 counties, or, roughly, 1 out of every 6, in this richest country on earth have no public libraries at all.

The bill has the support of the American Library Association, which realizes that in spite of its importance to democracy the public library, like the public school, has been neglected. The urgent need for strengthening our public school and library service is once again proven by the high rate of rejection of men under Selective Service for educational deficiencies.

Reports by both House and Senate committees during the last session of Congress have made it crystal clear that the quality of public education in the United States is suffering by virtue of the great financial hardship under which our public schools are struggling. The detailed survey of the need for school construction throughout the United States released by the Office of Education last year portrayed a situation which is nothing short of appalling. The President has told us that immediate action must be taken in an attempt to correct this situation. Nonetheless, and even if this Congress does act promptly and effectively—as I hope it will—to pass legislation calling for school construction, it will be some years before the deterioration in the quality of public-school instruction which has occurred in this country can be corrected. In the meantime, those young people who have been and are being deprived of the proper quality of education must look to the public-library system to help make up the deficiency.

Library service complements and supplements the work of our schools by carrying the school into the home.

Schools cannot serve their maximum usefulness without adequate libraries to provide home reading and other educational materials. The public library extends the educational process for the adult who may find that his schooling of 10 or 20 years ago is inadequate in meeting today's problems. This bill provides the cheapest and most effective way I know for bringing within the reach of every citizen the tools for continuous education.

Never in our history have the people had greater need for knowledge upon which to base their opinions and build their decisions. With the many grave problems facing our Nation today our national welfare demands that the ordinary citizen be able to get books, newspapers, and other sources of knowledge about the world he lives in.

The tasks of peace are the most difficult ever to challenge the genius of a nation. A highly trained, fully informed citizenry is essential to the defense of our freedom, the preservation of our country, and the building of lasting peace.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate the committee for the splendid job they have done on this much needed bill. Its passage is most important to the future cultural development of the Nation. In my State of Idaho, for example, about half of the population is without adequate library service. Many of the smaller communities do not have any libraries at all. The type of assistance offered in this bill will be of inestimable value. The bill as it now stands is the result of several years of constant improvement, and is the best thinking and efforts of successive congressional committees. I sincerely hope it will be passed today.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot be too strong in my endorsement of this legislation. There is no way to estimate the good it will do in my district. Already the State and several of the counties of my district are operating bookmobiles. The people cluster about these bookmobiles everywhere they stop and are hungry for the good literature that they distribute. The devoted men and women that are promoting the rural library program in my district and in fact my entire State with this Federal help will be able to reach many, many more people who are anxious for this service.

I want to congratulate the committee on bringing this bill to the floor of the House for consideration and I hope prompt passage. Especially I want to commend my very able and distinguished colleague from Georgia, the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, who was chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on and reported this bill. He has done a service not only to his State but to the Nation. Likewise I want to extend my congratulations and thanks to every member of his subcommittee for the time and thought they have given to this most important legislation. I am glad to vote for the bill.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, at this point in the proceedings, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following resolution which was passed unanimously by the 700 delegates to the

Catholic Library Association Convention, held in Boston, Mass., April 6, 1956, and sent me by the Reverend Vincent T. Mallon, M. M., the executive secretary of the Catholic Library Association:

Whereas approximately 27 million Americans are without local public library service; and

Whereas the library services bill before Congress seeks to promote the further extension and development of public library service to the rural areas of our country which presently are without such services or have only inadequate services; and

Whereas the library services bill requests aid limited to rural areas amounting to \$7,500,000 in Federal funds annually for a period of only 5 years, giving the States complete jurisdiction over developing their own State plans for the use of the funds in this cause: Be it

Resolved, That the Catholic Library Association heartily endorse the passage of the same library services bill, and recommend that a copy of this same resolution be forwarded immediately to the sponsors of this bill.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to imagine that there are children in this country of ours who are reared without ever having the chance to read as many books as they would like to read.

Yet, that is precisely the case in large areas of the country including three counties in my own State. And that deficiency is exactly what this library service bill will help correct.

For these young people can make just as vital and important contributions to our way of life as those more fortunately situated. Books and the desire for knowledge they stimulate can provide immeasurable contributions to our Nation.

And even as important as reaching the rural areas of America, as this bill will do, it will also reach those fringe communities around our fast-growing urban centers. Such is the case within my own congressional district.

The communities of Plymouth and Northville and the adjacent townships of the same names in my district will directly benefit from this legislation.

Adequate well-staffed libraries serve the needs of another segment of our population as well. I refer to our older citizens who find real pleasure in reading and using the facilities of our libraries.

This legislation has outstanding merit and I am pleased to have been one of the sponsors in this session of Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H. R. 2840, is identical to a bill which I introduced last year. Many other Members, on both sides of the aisle, also introduced identical bills. I would not want this occasion to pass without saying that I consider this to be very constructive legislation, and I should like to take this opportunity to commend the House Committee on Education and Labor for bringing it before us.

I feel that the library-services bill will fill a gap in our educational program which has been too long neglected. I realize that it may be hard for some who reside in the great metropolitan areas to understand fully the problems that beset our farmers. But surely there can be no

question about the great value of good public-library service, and about the necessity for adequate library facilities if we are to achieve the kind of an educational program that we would all like to achieve.

Education does not stop with formal schooling. It must meet the rapidly changing needs of the times, in business, in industry, and in cultural development. The public library, an agency serving all ages, all classes, and all creeds, is particularly fitted to perform this function. In many rural areas the facilities simply have not been available to enable the people who live there to keep pace with the remainder of the population.

As already has been said, this bill authorizes an appropriation of \$7.5 million a year for 5 years on a Federal-State matching basis. It is contemplated that during the 5-year period the States and local communities will develop their own library-service plans which will permit the Federal Government to discontinue its work in this field.

Each State is to receive an original allotment of \$40,000, and then an additional amount based on the ratio of its rural population to the total rural population of the United States. Under this formula, the State of Oklahoma will receive an annual allotment of \$146,811.

The population of Oklahoma, according to the 1950 census, was 2,233,357, of which 49 percent was classified as rural. Fewer than one-half of our citizens have access to any type of local public-library service, and many others have only limited or inadequate service. Twenty-one of the 77 counties in Oklahoma are without any public-library service at all. Only 79,932 of the 266,995 residents in my own congressional district have any kind of library service.

The Oklahoma library-development plan, which can be put into action under terms of this bill, calls for a system of bookmobile routes, deposit stations, and branch libraries. This system will give us an opportunity to prepare for the permanent establishment of libraries in rural areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to repeat what I have said before, that this bill will give the rural people of this country access to public-library facilities which have long been available to those who reside in urban communities. This certainly is a constructive step in our broad educational program, and I trust there will not be a single vote cast against it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the library services bill, may I take this opportunity to thank the members of the Education Committee and Rules Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor.

My constituents in Ohio's 22d District are extremely fortunate in that they have outstandingly good library facilities, and they make good use of them. We are justly proud of the famous Cleveland Public Library. Other Ohio cities like Toledo, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Akron, and Youngstown have fine libraries, too.

But Ohio is also an agricultural State. The Ohio Development and Publicity



Commission reports that some 80 percent of Ohio's area is still farmland and that Ohio stands 11th among the States in agriculture. Library service in these rural areas is quite inadequate. For example:

Libraries in 1 county—Adams—received less than 11 cents per capita to operate their service in 1954. The combined income of the 2 libraries in this county was \$2,300.

Another—Morrow—received 18 cents per capita. Four libraries in this county had a combined income of \$3,150.

Libraries in 15 counties in Ohio received less than 50 cents per capita to operate their service in 1954.

Libraries in 29 counties received between 50 cents and 99 cents for service in the same year.

Thus exactly half of Ohio's 88 counties were getting less—and many much less—than a dollar per capita for library service. The amount of money required for minimum library service has been established by the American Library Association as \$1.50 per capita. This standard was established in 1948 and does not take into account the inflation of the last 8 years.

Ninety-nine of the 271 public libraries in Ohio received less than \$7,000 as an operating budget in 1954. That amount is not enough to hire one librarian, rent space, pay for heat and light, and have money left over to buy an adequate supply of books.

A survey by the Ohio State Library showed 850,000 residents of the State with inadequate service.

Mr. Speaker, libraries in my district will receive none of this money since the program is limited to communities with less than 10,000 population. But I am happy to support this legislation in the interest of hundreds of thousands of citizens of my State, in addition to some 27 million people throughout this country, who are without access to modern library services.

I urge that favorable action be taken on this library services bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this, as a result of the remark recently made on the floor, that I understand 46 out of the 48 States have enabling legislation for the operation of these libraries, and there are 24 that employ direct tax levies for their support. It is not a new thing. The States are struggling along with it now, and I thought that information should go in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, there have been many fine speeches made here this afternoon on this legislation, and I am sorry that the one I am about to make may not fall in that category. But, I am vitally interested in this legislation. I think it is sound. I think it meets the objections of those who believe in States rights, and I certainly could not support it unless I believed that it did meet those objections.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SELDEN. Will my colleague from Alabama tell the Committee how and to what extent the States are protected from Federal interference under the terms of this proposed legislation?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would say to the gentleman that I think in section 2 of the bill, paragraph (b), there is one protection where it says that:

The provisions of this act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services.

It further says:

The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

There is a further protection in section 5, paragraph (5) where it says:

That any library services furnished under the plan shall be made available free of charge under regulations prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

There is a third protection in paragraph (c) which says:

The determination of whether library services are inadequate in any area within any State shall be made by the State library administrative agency of such State.

There are two more protections. Section 6, paragraph (e) provides that:

No portion of any money paid to a State under this act shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or for the purchase of any land.

And in paragraph (f) there is a further protection where it says that:

No portion of any money paid to a State under this act shall be used, directly or indirectly, to provide or improve library services in any area other than a rural area.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman for reemphasizing those important points. I join him in support of the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to urge the House of Representatives to adopt the legislation now pending before us, H. R. 2840, which will bring library services to millions of Americans. I cannot overemphasize both the tangible and intangible value, benefits, and rewards, the passage of this legislation by us today will have for so many Americans.

The purpose of this bill is to bring library services to millions who are presently without such services. It is shocking to realize that in this very wealthy Nation of ours, 27 million people have no access to a local public library of any kind. And there are 53 million Americans who have access to only very inadequate local public library services. This is approximately one-half the Nation's entire population without any library facilities or with only very inadequate facilities. As the majority of these people live in rural areas, the provisions of H. R. 2840 provide that the Federal assistance will be used to aid just these needy rural areas.

I personally feel that the provisions of H. R. 2840 are very carefully and

thoughtfully worked out. The bill, as drafted, would accomplish its purpose of establishing rural library services and yet the bill contains proper safeguards which meet the criticisms previously leveled at such proposals. This bill provides for States to participate and control this program. A formula has been worked out for the States to match the Federal funds on an ability-to-pay formula which is realistic. It encourages the States to participate in the library services program and yet it does not deprive the individual citizen of the benefits of library assistance funds because he lives in a State not as economically wealthy as perhaps the neighboring State. Funds will go where they are most needed. The question of Federal control has also been provided for by placing the administration of the program in the hands of each of the States' library extension agency.

Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this bill by the House today will be interpreted as a very fine, beneficent deed. It is interesting to note that representatives from metropolitan areas testified before the House Education and Labor Committee in behalf of this legislation although their communities personally would not derive direct benefits from the bill. Certainly the interest of the rural areas in bookmobiles and their overwhelming success is *prima facie* evidence that our rural citizens do want good literature, and will use and benefit from rural library service.

The terrific success of the paper-back editions of the great classics is another indication that the citizens of our Nation do have a hunger, nourished only by reading. We should be pleased by this fact and encourage it. What greater bulwark is there for democracy than a well-read, well-informed citizenry? The increased use of libraries can also be beneficial in combating undesirable comic magazines, and too many television crime shows. It can be an effective aid in helping reduce juvenile delinquency by providing a positive force and activity for young people.

The duration of the program proposed in H. R. 2840 is for 5 years. This is adequate time for the States to undertake positive programs and to measure their success. At the conclusion of the 5 years, Congress would also have an opportunity to review the program's success and determine whether or not Federal assistance was still needed. I believe it is anticipated that once the programs are started during this 5-year period, Federal assistance will no longer be needed.

There are many people in my own district who are extremely interested in seeing the wonderful program proposed in this legislation, H. R. 2840, undertaken. And I know there are many Members of the House who also represent rural residents, who are anxious to have library facilities for their children and so they may continue to increase their own knowledge and education through literature.

The educational, cultural, and social benefits to be derived from this legislation, H. R. 2840, are very great. I hope it will have the overwhelming support of

this House so interested in the welfare of all our citizens.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama who has so ardently promoted this legislation for a long period of time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman. I merely wished to say that it seems to me that one of the greatest safeguards for this democracy contained in this bill is that it provides the opportunity for a better informed and a more enlightened citizenry. There can be no greater protection than that.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has expired.

All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Library Services Act."*

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) It is the purpose of this act to promote the further extension by the several States of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services.

(b) The provisions of this act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each of the 4 succeeding years the sum of \$7,500,000 which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the commissioner of education (hereinafter referred to as the commissioner) State plans for the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services, or with inadequate services.

#### ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3 for each fiscal year, the commissioner shall allot \$10,000 to the Virgin Islands and \$40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the rural population of the State bears to the rural population of the United States, according to the most recent decennial census.

(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year remaining unpaid to such State at the end of such fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State under section 6 until the end of the succeeding fiscal year. No payment to a State under section 6 shall be made out of its allotment for any fiscal year until its allotment for the preceding fiscal year has been exhausted or has ceased to be available.

#### STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) To be approved under this section, a State plan for the further extension of public library services to rural areas must—

(1) provide for the administration, or supervision of the administration, of the plan by the State library administration agency, and provide that such agency will have ade-

quate authority under State law to administer the plan in accordance with its provisions and the provisions of this act;

(2) provide for the receipt by the State treasurer (or, if there be no State treasurer, the officer exercising similar functions for the State) of all funds paid to the State pursuant to this act and for the proper safeguarding of such funds by such officer, provide that such fund shall be expended solely for the purposes for which paid, and provide for the repayment by the State to the United States of any such funds lost or diverted from the purposes for which paid;

(3) provide policies and methods of administration to be followed in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State plan, which policies and methods the State library administrative agency certifies will in its judgment assure use of such funds to maximum advantage in the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services;

(4) provide that the State library administrative agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require; and

(5) provide that any library services furnished under the plan shall be made available free of charge under regulations prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The determination of whether library services are inadequate in any area within any State shall be made by the State library administrative agency of such State.

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 4, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 5 an amount computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions under such plan during the period for which such payment was made, except that no payments shall be made to any State from its allotment for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that (1) there will be available for expenditure under the plan from State or local sources during the fiscal year for which the allotment is made (A) sums sufficient to enable the State to receive under this section payments in an amount not less than \$10,000 in the case of the Virgin Islands and \$40,000 in the case of any other State, and (B) not less than the total amount actually expended, in the areas covered by the plan for such year, for public library services from State sources in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and (2) there will be available for expenditure for public library services from State sources during the fiscal year for which the allotment is made not less than the total amount actually expended for public library services from such sources in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time, but not less often than semiannually, and prior to the period for which a payment is to be made, estimate the amount, within the balance of the allotments for each State, which may be necessary to pay the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out the approved State plan for such period. The Commissioner shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so determined, reduced or increased as the case may be by the amount by which he finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the

General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

(c) For the purposes of this section the "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent less the State percentage and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 percent or less than 33 percent, and (2) the Federal share for Hawaii shall be 50 percent and for Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 percent.

(d) The "Federal share" for each State shall be promulgated by the Commissioner between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall promulgate such percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of this act to be effective until July 1, 1956.

(e) No portion of any money paid to a State under this act shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or for the purchase of any land.

(f) No portion of any money paid to a State under this act shall be used, directly or indirectly, to provide or improve library services in any area other than a rural area; except that nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit the utilization of such money by public libraries in nonrural areas for the exclusive purpose of extending public library services to rural areas, if such utilization has been provided for in an approved State plan covering the areas affected.

#### WITHHOLDING

SEC. 7. If the Commissioner finds after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this act, that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of this act or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with the provisions required to be included in the plan, he shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, he shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State.

#### ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and shall, with the approval of the Secretary, prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make such studies, investigations, and reports as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, including periodic reports for public distribution as to the values, methods, and results of various State demonstrations of public library services in rural areas undertaken under this act.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenses of administration such sums as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary and the Commissioner under this act.



## DEFINITIONS

Sec. 9. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands;

(b) The term "State library administrative agency" means the official State agency charged by State law with the extension and development of public library services throughout the State;

(c) The term "public library" means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds;

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(e) The term "rural area" does not include an incorporated or unincorporated town having a population of more than 10,000 persons.

Mr. BARDEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill has clearly brought out, I believe, the real need, the practicality, and the sound philosophy of this bill.

About the sole argument against it has been raised around the fear of Federal encroachment on States rights. Normally, perhaps, that would be something which would give pause to many of us, but the rebuttals already made by those Members in the House who are widely recognized as champions of States rights are to my mind utterly convincing.

Mr. Chairman, I have received from the librarian of the county of Los Angeles the following letter, together with an editorial which he enclosed from the Pasadena Star-News of Sunday, March 11, 1956:

APRIL 23, 1956.

JAMES ROOSEVELT,  
Congressman, House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: In the interests of public library service I am urging your support of library services bill S. 205 and H. R. 2840, which I understand is to be up for a vote imminently. The merits of this measure are evidenced in the meager public library facilities available in our less privileged States. California is not among these on a statewide basis, however, there are rural areas here that would gain from outside support. I am thinking particularly of Del Norte County, Mono, Alpine, Yuba, Mendocino, and other counties without county library facilities and apparently unable to get local funds for the purpose, although efforts have been made in this direction a number of times. In this State there are 73 cities and counties with less than 10,000 population who would receive support if the library services bill is approved. It is estimated that California's share would be \$239,598 each year for 5 years, a sum of money that would do great good in the regions now without adequate library facilities.

The proposed measure would allow Federal support on a demonstration basis and would enable the local jurisdictions to enjoy library facilities and resources at a minimum level of service for a limited period.

In this part of the State, that is, southern California, we are proud of the library facilities that are available to our residents. This, however, is not true statewide, and the only answer seems to be a Federal funded demonstration. The need in other States where facilities are meager hardly needs emphasizing. Your support of the bill is urged as a matter of public education for all ages in all parts of the country.

For your further information I am enclosing a processed copy of an editorial supporting the library services bill which appeared in the Pasadena Star-News, Sunday, March 12.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. HENDERSON,  
County Librarian.

[From the Pasadena Star-News of March 11, 1956]

## CONGRESS ASKED TO AID RURAL AMERICAN LIBRARIES

Because Pasadena ranks far and away ahead of most American cities in the number and use of its libraries, its citizens are rightly interested in seeing that book-hungry Americans, wherever they are, do not suffer for want of access to books.

Pasadena can point with pride that with a circulation of 1,320,071 books last year it reached the height of 11.95 books per capita, while the national average is only 3.90 for cities of 100,000 or more population.

For this very reason Pasadenans will be interested in the library-services bill now before Congress. A letter to your Senator or Congressman may help bookless Americans enjoy some of the advantages you take for granted.

This measure authorizes an appropriation of \$7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period to allot matching funds to States for the further development of public-library services in rural areas. The story of lack of books which underlies the project is almost of scandalous proportions.

Approximately 27 million Americans are without local public-library services, according to the American Library Association, principal sponsor of the bill. Almost 90 percent of these persons live on farms or in small villages. In addition 53 million more Americans receive only very inadequate public-library service.

The fact that 80 million, almost half the population, are ill-served with library books certainly is something that the richest country in the world should feel real shame about. Americans yearly spend many times more for cosmetics, cigarettes, television, or movies than they do for libraries; in fact they spend less than a dollar per year per person on the operating expenditures of public libraries. Books seem to be America's poor relations.

What the bill will do is to extend by the use of bookmobiles and other means the present range of free public libraries. Beyond question, this will promote the general welfare by broadening the opportunities of farm and small-town dwellers. This is certainly in the national interest and it is not difficult to justify the National Government's assumption of some of the costs.

Mr. Chairman, I have also received the following letter from Mrs. A. Kenneth Spencer, president of the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.:

JANUARY 26, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of managers of the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, representing a membership of 1,187,032, urges your support of H. R. 2840.

Our reasons for asking your support of this bill are:

There are approximately 480,084 persons in the State of California who are totally

without public library service. Many more have service which is completely inadequate. At least 90 percent of this number live in rural or village-type communities.

Passage of bill will provide stimulus for the development of library service for all children, instead of merely a fortunate proportion.

Every year, many rural boys and girls migrate to urban communities, to become a part of city life and to obtain city advantages. In early years, they should have had the same advantages for intellectual growth as those youngsters growing up in urban life.

This bill will not only provide an extension of library service to the communities lacking such service, but will provide a means of studying effective ways for an even greater expansion by means of increased interest and aroused hope.

The public library complements and supplements the school. There is little use in giving our young people an education unless we are willing and able to provide the tools for the maintenance and continuation of that education.

We thank you for your cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing communications come from distinguished sources and represent responsible, conservative in the best sense, organizations. I emphasize them because primarily they come from people who will not benefit directly from this bill but who support this library service for rural areas.

It certainly does come as a startling fact, I believe, that in as forward a State as California there are 480,000 people, totally without public-library service. The facts show the same situation or worse is nationwide. It seems to me beyond question that a democracy, a free Nation, cannot tolerate such a situation.

The argument which has been raised that this is something which could and should be settled on the local level I think does not recognize the plain fact that the reason why this situation exists is that State legislatures have not been sufficiently willing to consider the needs of the rural areas; the preponderance of influential votes in the State legislatures have ignored the needs of these rural areas. Therefore, there needs to be some additional incentive in order to take care of the problem, and this bill does it on a national basis.

As Mrs. Spencer so well puts it:

The public library supplements and complements the school. There is little use in giving our young people an education unless we are willing and able to provide the tools for the maintenance and continuation of that education.

Mr. Chairman, a more easily administered and more directly beneficial bill without interference with the rights of anyone would be hard to find. I wholeheartedly urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona: On page 4, strike out all of lines 8 through 11 and substitute "(4) provide that the State library administrative agency will make such reports as to categories of expenditures made under this act as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because it

appears to me that the section amended as it is in the bill is far too broad. The section now provides that the State library administrative agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require.

"Containing such information" could cover almost anything. This is a highly sensitive field. It is a field in which I feel that every Member of this House wants the will of the State and the local government to dominate, insofar as the administration of the program is concerned, and certainly insofar as the purchase of books is concerned.

I think I probably have more respect for the Supreme Court than perhaps some Members of the House do, at least as indicated in the past few days and weeks on this floor. At the same time, I can see the possibility that this language might be construed in such a manner as to provide that the State library administrative agency would have to list the books which it bought and give such list to the Commissioner.

I can see further that it might be construed in such a way that the Commissioner might have to approve such a list of books which might be bought, and that if the Commissioner did not approve them, acting under section 7, the withholding provision, the Commissioner might be able to withhold substantial financial aid from any State which does not comply.

Therefore, this amendment is offered, which limits the report as to the category of expenditures made under the act, which means to me that the Commissioner could require that the State report as to how much money was spent on personnel, how much money was spent on the purchase of books, how much money was spent on the purchase of bookmobiles, and such things as that, but not become much more specific than that.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Arizona that there should be no question but that the local agencies are going to be the people who select the books and that the Commissioner should, without any qualification, have no power whatsoever to demand a list of the books or any categories of books that were selected for bookmobiles or libraries. I feel, however, the categories of expenditures are too narrow and too rigid a classification. It seems to me this section on reporting may well be one of the most important sections in the bill after the first 5 years have passed. All this goes back to the local agency because the dissemination of information, technique, and methods that the various of these 404 counties have used will permit an economy of operation and permit the States and local agencies to take advantage of the mistakes made in the other areas. So if you just say categories of expenditures, it seems to me it would narrow it so much that you would not be permitted to take advantage of techniques or methods of operations and

the Commissioner could not get the kind of information which is necessary to make this reporting effectual.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will say to the gentleman that I have no intent to limit the scope of any voluntary reports which the Office of Education might request. All I am trying to do is to limit the scope of a required report. Certainly, I agree with the gentleman that these reports as to techniques and other matters might be very important, but I cannot imagine a State agency refusing a voluntary request for a report such as the gentleman sets forth. I hope the reports will be requested and that they will be forthcoming, but I do not feel that there should be any such requirement in the bill as to such reports.

Mr. METCALF. It is the gentleman's understanding in submitting this amendment that such things as a report on whether it is more efficient to use a bookmobile or a library center or whether techniques of cooperating with urban libraries on methods or the routing of bookmobiles, and things of that sort, would not be exactly a category of expenditure, but would be a method or technique that could be asked for by the Commissioner.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. On a voluntary basis, I will say anything may be asked for by the Commissioner and there is certainly nothing against it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I read the amendment and I readily recognize the gentleman's objection. Frankly, I was of the frame of mind to accept the amendment for this reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Arizona may be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. This is a report made by the State officials who certainly would be just as much interested or more so than the United States Commissioner of Education. I think the average State official, certainly with normal intelligence—and I do not know of any of them who do not have more than, far more than, normal intelligence—would want to make the kind of report which would be most helpful to the program. I have always been reluctant to put in that clause which gives to the United States Commissioner of Education authority to demand such reports, and so forth and so on, as he may from time to time require. I have never liked that kind of centralization. But, I believe in this program. The State officials will give to the Commissioner, and gladly do so, every particular of pertinent information for the benefit of the program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman. It is my thesis in offering this amendment that any pertinent information which the Commissioner desires will be forthcoming, but that any impertinent information which the Com-

missioner might someday require need not be given by a State if it does not desire to do so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am in agreement with the gentleman from Arizona. It seems to me if we are sincere, that all we are trying to do is to stimulate the States in helping them move forward and in getting started those that have not started. Then in all sincerity all we should really require is that there is simply accounting of the funds received. I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, the only point I wanted to make is that this information that the chairman has discussed is so important, and I am sure most of the library services of most States will want it, but I do not want to make the reporting system so narrow or so confined that you can just report expenditures. If it is the gentleman's understanding that it is the consensus of opinion that under his amendment, on a voluntary basis more essential information could be asked for by the Commissioner and could be disseminated, I would have no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is my understanding, that on a voluntary basis any information can be asked for.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I just wish to say to my colleague that I agree with him. I think his amendment would be an asset to this bill. I am not in favor of the bill, but I am in favor of improving it in any way we can.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the library service bill which we have before us. At this time I particularly wish to commend the committee for the very excellent work it has done, and especially to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] for her interest and for her concern in what I believe to be a very important and very vital issue in America today.

I came to the floor today under the impression that this was a fine piece of legislation and that there would be no objection to it. In fact, I had an opportunity to speak to a constituent just a short time before coming to the floor, and I informed her that as far as I knew there was no opposition. So I have been rather amazed that we have heard opposition to this particular piece of legislation. I wish to agree with the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] in his reference to the importance of having an informed citizenry in America. Nothing is so important and so vital. The maintenance of our democratic way of life and our democratic



ideals requires a dispensing of knowledge that is so important.

Particularly, I feel it is vital in many of the areas of our country today where it has not heretofore been done.

From my own district, in the State of California, I have had a great many communications regarding this particular bill. It is for that reason that I took the time of this Committee today. Every one of those communications has been asking me to vigorously support this legislation. I have not had a single communication from the State of California in opposition.

I was inclined to some extent to shed a few tears with the gentleman from New York a little while ago when he made the great plea with reference to the condition of the taxpayers in his State. I come from a State second in wealth only to the gentleman's State; and certainly I know that we will furnish a good percentage of the money that will go into this program, but even in the light of that I have had complete unanimity of thought from the people of my district as well as my State in support of this legislation. So certainly I am very happy to be able to come here and commend the committee on this particular legislation, and I hope it will receive the overwhelming support of the membership of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. MACDONALD. Like the gentleman from California, I have had considerable correspondence from the people of my area also supporting the legislation. I want to associate myself with the gentleman in his remarks.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from California, I have had correspondence from a number of the librarians in my district favoring the enactment of this proposal.

There is no need here to argue the value of the public library system. And I am positive that nobody on this floor today questions that value. The issue, it seems to me, is whether this Congress is going to make it easier for the people of the Nation to avail themselves of the great benefits inherent in the public library. The plan before us today will greatly improve and stimulate that system.

The testimony adduced at the hearings on this bill disclose that many of the citizens do not have the opportunities to use the public library system because of inadequate facilities in many of the regions of this great and vast country. The accompanying report states that only in the States of Delaware, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island does local public library service reach every resident. I suspect that one of the reasons for this is because of their geographic area; they are three of the smallest in the Nation. Thus, it is much easier for them to have a system of public book lending that reaches all of the inhabitants.

I know that there is some concern here today that the States and communities ought to bear the responsibility of providing adequate library facilities—that there should be no handout by the Fed-

eral Government to accomplish what the local communities ought to do.

Mr. Chairman, a well-educated and well-versed citizenry enriches the whole Nation. Federal funds have been used in other programs to stimulate areas and citizens. These activities have added to the country's wealth. This program will do likewise. It has not been possible for many of the rural sections of the country to establish an adequate library system. Failure to do so can be attributed in large degree to inadequate funds and the unwillingness of officials to start such a program. This bill corrects those deficiencies. It provides Federal stimulation for a limited period. There is no doubt that it will demonstrate the tremendous value of a good library system resulting in the local communities carrying the load when the Federal grants have ceased.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I refer to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to the committee amendment. I have no right to say, of course, that the committee approves; however, I do believe that certainly most of the committee members, and I am not sure but what all of them, agree with the amendment. At least there is no opposition from here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct several dates in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN:

Page 5, line 16 and line 21, strike out "June 30, 1955" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956."

Page 7, line 11, strike out "July 1, 1956" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1957."

On page 2, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1956" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona: On page 8, line 14, after the words "such State", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That any State or State agency is entitled to judicial review in the United States District Court wherein the State or State agency is located on any such withholding determinations in accordance with applicable provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, section 7 of this act provides that in certain circumstances, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may find that a State is out of conformity with the State plan and may then withhold funds from the State under this bill until the State is back in conformity.

This amendment merely provides for official determination and judicial review of any such finding before it becomes final.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not strike out any language; it adds to and gives a safeguard just in case we did have an arbitrary Commissioner who might want to do something wrong, and it gives the added safeguard of a court review in a situation where a difference might arise between the Commissioner of Education and the State officials.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. I may say to the gentleman, that so far as I know, there is no objection to his amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is precisely correct in his interpretation of the amendment and I thank him.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I also wish to state that I strongly favor this amendment. I know of no objection to it on this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GWINN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this motion is to point out one of the rankest kinds of class legislation against the industrial States that I have ever seen. The following appears on page 7 of the bill:

(f) No portion of any money paid to a State under this act, shall be used, directly or indirectly, to provide or improve library services in any area other than a rural area; except that nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit the utilization of such money by public libraries in non-rural areas for the exclusive purpose of extending public library services to rural areas, if such utilization has been provided for in an approved State plan covering the areas affected.

That last part of the language is a little vague, possibly. What kind of service would a library in a county seat serve that would be purely rural? As a matter of fact it seems to me utterly fantastic that the boys and girls that now come to every county seat to attend the movies, the church, and other services would not go to the library. I would just guess that in North Carolina there is not a boy or girl that cannot go to Durham or some other town much better than he would be inclined to go to a new rural library.

In New York only about six-tenths of 1 percent of our population is so-called rural population. As you gentlemen know, it is much further in time and convenience and safety for a youngster to go from the Bowery to the Fifth Avenue library than it would be for nearly all of the children in Arkansas to go to the nearby town or village for their library services. Besides that, the industrial

States that pay 57 percent of the cost of this legislation will get practically no service back under this bill. That is, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois and California. They are going to be on the paying side and not on the receiving side of this service. Everyone has areas in their cities that need this kind of service even worse than they do in what might be called the most backward rural areas.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, you know I am sorry this happened, because I have been in a good humor all day, and I am going to try to hold out for the rest of the day. I accepted all of the amendments that came over, and I thought that was doing right well, until my friend from New York pushed me to the wall.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to consume my 5 minutes. I will say to the House that I sincerely hope the motion will be promptly voted down.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman does not wish to consume his time, would he yield to me?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, but I do not want you to stir up any trouble.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I have such confidence in my friend's sense of strategy, that I would hesitate to speak at all.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman knows how to stay out of trouble.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Well, I hope so. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], who knows of my fondness for him looked over at me a moment ago when he made reference to the State of Arkansas, and I felt that that might call for a reply. Now I try to be very modest about my State. I have never said anything more glowing about it than to echo the accolade of Governor Brough "the greatest commonwealth in the galaxy of sovereign powers whose star shines out from our flag like the brightest orb of celestial night."

I do appreciate the serious approach to this problem that my friend from New York has manifested. He and I have had some private talks about this problem of disparity of wealth between rural and urban centers. I have long ago given up hope that within our lifetime there will be an approximate equalization of income between the two. But, this is a step toward equalization of the facilities and the services that will enrich rural culture. The rural areas of our country are losing population. Their resources are being reduced. They need help. They need all of the enriching influences they can get. The bill, by encouraging further exertions by the States, will help supply them. People want more than incomes; they want the things that add happiness and cultural growth. I think the Federal Government has a responsibility in this connection and I will say to my good friend from New York that I see it as an act of justice, rather than as a measure that imposes something upon the industrial sections deriving no direct benefits. The bill would, however, provide a counterbalancing influence for the aid of the rural areas that must continue to struggle against adversity.

Mr. Chairman, this is a notable piece of legislation. It meets the finest standards that the committee could devise for a grant-in-aid program in a field in which the Federal Government has definite responsibilities. We sometimes speak of the great library movement as if it were a new factor in our educational life, but even in colonial times the value of books and the facilities for wide distribution of them was recognized. In spite of our progress, 25 million people, most of whom live in the rural communities, are without adequate library service. A half million people in my State do not have access to libraries. They live in rural areas. Yet, considering our limited tax resources, the people of Arkansas are manifesting a generous attitude toward library service. In recent years interest has been mounting rapidly. The junior chamber of commerce is rendering an outstanding civic service in providing leadership in this field.

I am reluctant to speak on the subject, because I have not been closely identified with the problem in recent years, but today we have had the benefit of the studies made by the Committee on Education, and it seems to me that those who have worked out this proposed legislation have rendered a splendid service. They have given us convincing facts and figures and the reasons for launching this modest program.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the fact that library service is primarily a local and State responsibility. With that, I concur, but with an expenditure of only 5 cents per capita per year, it is obvious that the Federal Government is not going to relieve local governments of their financial obligations in this field. My own State, which does not enjoy a relatively high per capita income, expends seven times this amount, and, as I have indicated, still is not able to provide adequate service for the rural areas.

It cannot be overemphasized that the purpose of this grant-in-aid is to stimulate a service, not to underwrite it or to permanently assume a share in it. I am sure we all applaud the 5-year limitation. As a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I became somewhat familiar with the Federal Government's involvement in grant-in-aid programs which were difficult to terminate, and this bill may help reverse that tendency. The Commission developed the fact that grants-in-aid must rest upon one or more of the following obligations of the Federal Government: to support, to stimulate, or to equalize costs of public service.

Library service might well be attributable to any or all of these grounds for Federal aid. Popular education cannot be complete without library facilities. I am sure that James Madison was thinking of the value of books and documents thus made available when he said:

Popular government without the means for disseminating information will become either a farce or a tragedy, perhaps both.

Mr. Chairman, we must make more books available to more people, and this bill is a long step in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after having taken 3 minutes to try to express myself briefly during general debate on this bill, I decided I had said all I intended to say on this measure. But my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] came into the debate. I do not know of anybody on the Democratic side whom I admire or respect more or to whom I turn more frequently for leadership and sincere and helpful advice. But I cannot let the Record stand with any feeling that because of anything said in the course of this debate, there is any animosity or jealousy whatsoever between the people I represent, many of whom would qualify for Federal assistance under this bill—and I probably have as large a rural area as there is in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—and the good people of Arkansas, the good people of North and South Carolina, the good people of Florida or those of any other State whom I have met where I have traveled and enjoyed myself there and whose problems I know to some degree, I think.

But this problem that has bothered me more and more as this afternoon has worn on goes back to 1950, 6 years ago. I just wonder why no one, in the course of the debate this afternoon, has tried to answer the question the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] raised: "Is there a single Representative of any one of our States who will take this floor to say his or her State cannot afford to do this for its people?"

I notice in the committee report it is stated that there are some 3,000 counties in the United States, 404 of them without a single public library in their borders. Why? If, with its local communities, any one of the 404 could not provide this vitally necessary service, will anyone here tell us it could not have been done with the assistance of that State?

But the significant thing to me is this, that in only 3 States, Delaware, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, does public library service reach every resident.

I am not here to praise the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or our neighbors in Rhode Island or in Delaware. They want no praise for doing what they recognized years ago needed to be done. But somehow or other they have found it possible to furnish library service to every single individual within the borders of those States. I cannot believe it has been beyond the capacities and resources of all the other States. And no one has offered us any good reason why this has not been done.

It seems to me, from one point of view, at least, that here are excellent examples for all of us, not a constant reaching to the Federal Government and asking it to do for us what we can do better for ourselves and should do better for ourselves. All of you know and most of you I suspect have said at one time or another that when we turn to the Federal Treasury, we have to pay a substantial broker's fee. Most of our States pay so



much in and then get that back minus a broker's fee. But it does something to us, it seems to me. If we take this easy course too often, we inevitably weaken ourselves; yes, we are in danger of degrading ourselves. I am not arguing that it is socialism and I am certainly not arguing that it involves any tendency toward communism. I am arguing as strongly as I can what I think has been placed before the people of this country, and has met with their overwhelming approval, by the President of the United States as recently as last April 17, when he stated a fundamental principle I want to quote:

The purpose of government is to serve, never to dominate. There has never been a better, clearer explanation than that given by Abraham Lincoln: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do, at all, or cannot, so well do, for themselves—in their separate, and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

I do not know the President's position on this bill; I doubt that he has taken any position on it, but he has pleaded with us to see fit somewhere, somehow, sometime as a Congress to draw the line and say to the States, our own States, our own people: "You can do this better than the Federal Government can do it."

The Federal Government today is taxing the initiative, the incentive, the lifeblood of its citizens, of your constituents and mine. Where are we going to draw the line? If we cannot do it this afternoon as to this proposal, on all the evidence we have, will we ever draw it?

I suspect that we will have no rollcall. But I remember that 6 years ago last March 9, 164 Members of that Congress stood up and said, "We draw the line here." There was only a majority of three who stopped the bill at that time and, in doing so, placed the challenge before all the States. What has been the answer? In all charity, I submit the record is discouraging, with only these three States apparently attempting to meet the challenge.

I hope—although I do not believe it will be done—I hope somebody, some responsible person will stand up here on this floor this afternoon and tell us what individual State in this Union cannot do this job better than the Federal Government. I say that if no one does, this challenge has not been met and we once again yield to the pressure that the Federal Government take over another of the important responsibilities of the States and local communities.

I wish I could say that I am confident that we will not do that. Even more important, I wish I could believe that this will be only a 5-year, temporary program of Federal assistance with the result the majority of the committee foresees that it will "be carried on in the future by State and local communities without Federal assistance." That is not the record, the undisputed history of Federal assistance programs. Even though few of us may be here to make the further decision, I venture to suggest that in 1961 Congress will be asked to continue the program, unless we here this afternoon

decide that this is the time when we must make the full results clear of the constant impairment upon the self-respect, the initiative and the incentive of our own people, through their State and local governments, when they can do as well or better for themselves than they can through the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas pursuant to House Resolution 479, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit tomorrow while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports on certain privileged resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every American today recognizes that the strongest weapon in our arsenal of defense against aggression is

the proper education of our young people.

How best to strengthen that weapon has become a subject of debate in every corner of the land and on the floor of this House. A large segment of the population is led to believe that the Federal Government must appropriate large sums of money to help the States and the local communities to provide the best possible public education facilities for our children. Another segment, fearful that financial support ultimately will lead to Federal control of the schools, insists that the problem should be left to the individual States. Both sides agree there is a school problem and that it demands solution if this and future generations of Americans are to retain their freedom.

Because this is such a vital problem, I would like to call the attention of the House to one of our school districts in the Ninth California Congressional District which is meeting that challenge of today and the future. Last September this district opened a new high school which might well serve as a guide and model to school people throughout the country. We call it the high school designed to stay young.

The new Hillsdale School at San Mateo, Calif., is more than an answer to the educational needs of today. Realizing that trends in education are subject to change, the planners and designers of the Hillsdale School have produced a building more than adequate to meet today's educational programs, but with a built-in flexibility to permit adjustment to tomorrow's new patterns.

Architects and school authorities already have showered honors upon the Hillsdale School. Just last month the American Institute of Architects cited it as one of the five outstanding architectural achievements of 1955. It was the only school to win 1 of the 5 top honors in the institute's eighth annual honor awards competition, which included structures of all types.

More recently—last Thursday in Chicago—it was selected from scores of entries as one of the Nation's outstanding examples of school design in the fifth annual competition for better school design, sponsored by the School Executive, a top publication in the school field. Judges in this competition described the Hillsdale School building as "a courageous approach to planning a school which has infinite possibilities for adaptation to changing enrollments and educational programs."

School authorities are agreed that progress in secondary education is evolving new approaches to learning which, in turn, will require the proper type of structures to implement those approaches. Too often the efforts toward progress in educational methods are handicapped by existing school structures designed to house earlier concepts of education.

Obviously no community—no State, not even the Federal Government—has the funds to undertake the astronomical financial burden of replacing every school building. New schools that are being designed, however, should possess the flexibility to meet future trends in education.

The Hillsdale School is designed for progress. Structurally, it is an invitation to new concepts in educational planning. Because alterations in the educational program almost certainly would require variations in room size and in the relation of one room to another, those areas where changes are most likely to occur have been given movable partitions. The partitions are completely reusable and subject to a wide variety of applications.

To make the room arrangements independent of the window walls, the Hillsdale School has been provided with an ingenious toplighting system to supply natural daylight for all areas. The alternative of completely artificial lighting was rejected because the designers felt it would have an isolating influence and would not be as pleasant as the natural daylight.

The toplighting system consists of hollow glass units set in prefabricated aluminum panels. Prisms in the glass units are designed to reject much of the heat and glare from the hot summer sun while admitting a higher percentage of light from the winter sun and most of the light from the cool north sky. Some 660 of these toplighting panels are installed in the roof of the Hillsdale School to assure controlled glare-free daylight for the interior.

Because the toplighting system assures a plentiful supply of the best daylight available in all seasons of the year, designers estimate that at least \$1,300 a year will be saved in the cost of power and artificial lighting tubes.

More important than economy, though, is the fact that the toplighting system permitted the planners to design a school which can be adjusted to fit the needs of the moment. Each 14-by-14-foot section of the building's classroom section can be made independent of its neighbors, as far as the electrical system and lighting, both natural and artificial, are concerned. Heat and ventilation for each 28-by-28-foot bay are controlled by automatic thermostats with a check on room temperatures available on a panel in the administration office.

The metal partition panels are available in solid units, or with various types of glazing or doors, and in a number of widths permitting a practically unlimited number of room arrangements. A special provision makes it possible to install the movable partitions at angles to improve acoustics and to avoid monotonous repetition.

In addition to its classroom facilities, the Hillsdale School has an auditorium and little theater, swimming facilities, and a cafeteria. It has a capacity of 1,750 students and was built at a cost of \$3,428,400 or \$14.84 per square foot, well within the national average cost of \$16 per square foot for school structures of its type. Because of its flexibility, educational experts predict it will actually be a real economy structure in years to come because its arrangement can be so easily changed to make efficient use of its space, regardless of trends in education.

I want to pay particular tribute to John Lyon Reid and his associates, the

San Francisco architects who designed the building; Thomas F. Reynolds, the high school district superintendent, and the group of educators who helped in the planning of the Hillsdale School; and to the San Mateo Board of Education which had the courage to support Mr. Reid and Mr. Reynolds in their courageous and revolutionary approach to a problem which is common to the Nation.

Between them, they have developed a functional idea in school construction which has unlimited plan possibilities. That their idea is a sound one is best attested to by the fact that Hillsdale teachers, pupils, and parents are agreed that their school building is the finest in the land.

To school authorities and to the designers of school buildings throughout the Nation, I offer the Hillsdale School—the high school that always will be young—as a shining example of how tomorrow's educational building problems can be solved today.

#### CAPITAL TRANSIT BILL

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to make known my opposition of the bill, H. R. 8901, dealing with the transit problem in the District of Columbia, which will be considered by the House in the near future.

Before discussing the merits of the bill, I would like to state that I have the greatest respect for the work done by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, for the immense difficulty of their task, and for the complete sincerity and integrity of their recommendations. I know personally that the subcommittee has worked diligently many hours and many days. But I cannot in good conscience agree that passage of H. R. 8901 is the proper solution to this most serious problem.

I sincerely feel that H. R. 8901 is an unwise bill and is certainly not in the public interest. We must remind ourselves as to the reasons which motivated the Congress last summer to revoke the franchise of the Capital Transit Co. Congress enacted Public Law 389 last year because of a demonstrated record of public irresponsibility on the part of the Capital Transit Co. under the Wolfson management. The 7-week strike of last summer had in effect been provoked by the management and was the climax of a public-be-damned attitude frequently exhibited by the company. Mr. Eisenhower, when he signed the bill revoking the franchise, stated:

Both the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have concluded that the Capital Transit Co., beginning several years ago and continuing up to the present time, has failed to measure up to its responsibilities in the District.

At this point I would like to review some of the relevant facts. The Wolfson

interests purchased control of the Capital Transit Co. in September of 1949. The approximate price on September 12, 1949, was \$20 per share—equivalent to \$5 a share after the 4-for-1 stock split—so the purchaser would have received 500 shares for an original investment of \$10,000. The return on the value of this investment to date is shown in the following table, which I would like to have printed at this point in my remarks:

Dividends paid during calendar year	Shares purchased plus new shares through stock split	Cash dividend per share	Cash dividend income
1949 (after Sept. 12).....	500	\$0.50	\$250
1950.....	500	3.00	1,500
1951.....	500	3.00	1,500
1951 (stock split, 4 for 1) ..	1,500	.....	.....
1951.....	2,000	.25	500
1952.....	2,000	3.90	7,800
1953.....	2,000	1.20	2,400
1954.....	2,000	1.40	2,800
1955.....	2,000	.60	1,200
Dividend income.....	.....	.....	17,950
Value of 2,000 shares at closing price, Monday, Apr. 30, 1956:.....	.....	.....	.....
Capital Transit Co.....	11 3/4	.....	23,500
Continental Enterprises (unlisted).....	* 1 1/4	.....	2,500
Value of investment plus cash dividends.....	.....	.....	43,950
Percentage gain on initial \$10,000 investment.....	.....	.....	339 1/2

\* Also 1 share Continental Enterprises in May.

\* Bid.

A gain of 339 1/2 percent over a period of less than 7 years is indeed fantastic. At the same time the company has cut service.

When the Wolfson interests purchased control in 1949, the last previous balance sheet of the company showed earned and unappropriated surplus of \$4,814,158. The company's published consolidated statement of assets and liabilities, December 31, 1955, shows earned surplus of \$252,746. Now the company has been operating at a profit. So that it is clear that the \$4 1/2 million which the people of the Washington area paid in went to the stockholders. In the 5 years after the Wolfson management obtained control, the company paid out more than twice as much in dividends—\$8,112,000—as had been paid out in the 10 years preceding the arrival of the Wolfson management—\$3,600,000.

At the same time that the stockholders were extracting lush dividends from the company the management continually refused to arbitrate disputes over contract terms with its employees. During the approximately 40 years in which the Capital Transit Co. and its predecessors dealt with the union which represents its rank-and-file employees there have been 58 days lost due to strikes. Fifty-five of these fifty-eight days took place during the era of the Wolfson management. In other words, only 3 days of strike took place during a period of 32 years prior to the advent of the Wolfson interests. Since that time there have been 55 days of strike in approximately 6 1/2 years.



It is difficult to see how, in the face of such a glaring record of public irresponsibility, the House can contemplate inviting the Wolfson interests back, with very substantial concessions, to continue and possibly to enlarge upon their anti-public record. H. R. 8901 contains many provisions which are inimical to the public interest, and fails to make other provisions which are important for the public interest. H. R. 8901 contains no provisions which would protect the employees of the company, while it contains many provisions to benefit the stockholders of the company. H. R. 8901 overlooks the fact that the revocation of the franchise took place during a period which was climaxed by the protracted strike in last summer's Washington heat. There is no reason to suppose that the concessions to the company found in H. R. 8901 will make for a more enlightened labor relations attitude on the part of the management, nor in any increased sense of responsibility to the community. Rich dividends did not in the past have any bearing upon the management's intransigent attitude toward the employees or upon management's refusal peacefully to arbitrate unsettled contract disputes with the employees. I do not think that it is in the public interest to restore a situation in which the people of Washington will have to walk to work again this summer.

Nor can one easily understand the relaxation of controls over rates to be charged the community by the company. Section 2 (c) of H. R. 8901 allows the company to establish its own rates subject to the right of the Public Utilities Commission to suspend or modify such rates during a 90-day period. What if the Commission finds the proposed rates unwarranted? Then the company can merely reinstitute its proposed schedule of rates and the Commission must again suspend the rates and hold hearings during another 90-day-period. Why hamper regulation of a utility which has clearly demonstrated that it requires regulation in the public interest?

Nor is there wisdom in freezing the rate base as of this time. The rate base of a public utility should be subject to close scrutiny. Depreciation studies involve an element of estimate in the projections made by engineers. If time shows that the projected life of certain property owned by a utility is likely to be longer or shorter than originally contemplated, the regulatory body should be free to, and indeed be under a duty to, reexamine its previous rate-base determinations.

I do not believe that the public interest would be served by giving to the management very substantial concessions and almost complete freedom from anything but slight regulation. There is reason to fear that the company will continue its history of richly rewarding its stockholders while reducing service to the community. There is reason to fear that we will be subjected to another strike provoked by the management this summer and have to walk again. There is reason to fear that if we hand this franchise back to the Wolfsons while rewarding them with liberal tax concessions this will not be the end of the trans-

sit problem for the Congress of the United States. There is reason to fear that we will have this problem back in our hands a year or two hence with the demand from the public for a lasting solution and not a short-lived public retreat foredoomed to failure at the outset.

Let me say, as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, that I do not favor a proposal to permit the Wolfson syndicate to continue their operations and to mulct the transit riders of the District of Columbia.

For the above reasons, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members of this body will defeat H. R. 8901.

#### VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a statement by Omer W. Clark, national director of legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a very fine analysis of the Bradley Commission legislative report on veterans' pensions, and other veterans matters. I agree with a great deal of it. As I have told the House before, I disagree with most of the things in the so-called Bradley report.

Our veterans have made an enormous contribution to our country. If we follow the philosophy of the Bradley Commission it will mean the wiping out of most of the work done by the Veterans' Administration and by the Congress and by the great veterans' organizations during many years. I sincerely hope the report will not be accepted as it is. I think no one has received word from the White House that it is to be endorsed, and I hope none will come.

Mr. Speaker, the statement by Major Clark, the former Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and at present national director of legislation of the DAC, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF OMER W. CLARK, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATION, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, RE PROPOSED LEGISLATION REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

In accordance with the request and invitation of your committee, I, Omer W. Clark, national director of legislation, Disabled American Veterans, am making this appearance accompanied by Mr. Cicero F. Hogan, national director of claims, and Mr. E. M. Freudenberger, assistant director of legislation.

The report of the President's Commission hereafter designated the Bradley Commission for the purpose of this presentation, has been made the subject of careful study and consideration in the light of the compensation program of this organization as outlined to your committee on previous occasions. There can be no question as to the importance of the Bradley Commission report whatever one may think of the contents. It undoubtedly constitutes a comprehensive reference work of the history and development of veterans' legislation. The problems confronting the

national economy by reason of the great numbers of veterans and their dependents and the future potentialities in this connection are treated in such manner as to attract the interest of all thoughtful citizens. Obviously, the members of the Bradley Commission are of the opinion that the full program of veterans' relief and assistance is at the crossroads and that a decision should now be made relative to the future course of the Nation in dealing with veterans and the many related and complex problems attaching to any measures having for their purpose the granting of benefits to those who served in time of national emergency, as well as in peacetime, and their survivors.

The question of future national policy thus posed is not so acute or difficult with regard to compensation matters as it is in the field of non-service-connected benefits. As you know, the Disabled American Veterans is primarily interested in the war disabled, their widows, children, and dependents. Some Bradley Commission proposals, if adopted, would be extremely destructive as to certain important facets of the compensation structure and are strongly opposed by this organization for the reasons stated herein. It is believed that it would make for simplicity to comment upon the recommendations in question by chapter and number. The fact that certain other recommendations are not made the subject of formal comment should not be taken as necessarily implying acceptance. Some of those recommendations are deemed inequitable, impractical, or otherwise undesirable from an administrative standpoint. It is thought best, however, to stress herein our opposition to the proposals of major, and particularly objectionable nature.

#### CHAPTER V

Recommendation No. 1 (p. 136): The Bradley Commission takes the position that military service is in the discharge of an obligation of citizenship and is not in itself a basis for future Government benefits. The Disabled American Veterans realizes, as does every right thinking person, that the obligation of citizenship carries with it the duty and privilege of defending the Nation in time of war, stress, or national emergency. However, it has been the long established and historic policy of the United States to consider veterans as a group apart in awarding legislative benefits, the propriety of which has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Congress.

Recommendation No. 2 (pp. 136-137): Comment on the subject covered by this recommendation of the Commission will be offered under chapter No. XI.

Recommendation No. 3 (p. 138): We heartily agree that service-connected benefits should be accorded the highest priority and that such benefits should be "liberal, even generous." With reference to paragraph (c) under this recommendation this organization concurs that "non-service-connected benefits are the lowest priority among veterans' programs" but we would invite your attention to our further comment on this subject under chapter XI.

Recommendation No. 4 (p. 139): See our comment under chapter XI.

Recommendation No. 5 (p. 140): The Disabled American Veterans agrees that the Government, and especially the Veterans' Administration, should develop and maintain a rounded research program.

Recommendation No. 6 (p. 141): See comment under chapter VI, recommendation No. 10.

Recommendation No. 8 (p. 144): The Bradley Commission states "We should not commit future generations to obligations that we ourselves are unwilling to shoulder." No one, or several generations, can conduct a war and pay for it. When peace is attained, or there is even the sort of pseudo-peace that

now exists, the postwar generations benefit immeasurably by the heavy personal and financial exertions and sacrifices made by the veterans and their families during wartime. This fact should never be lost sight of by any administration and Congress in providing for liquidation of war debts and the aftermath. It is believed that the future generations, so solicitously referred to by the Bradley Commission, should indeed pay their full share for the wars and conflicts that saved the Nation and increased their security.

#### CHAPTER VI

Recommendation No. 10 (p. 168): In paragraph (a) a revision of the VA rating schedule is urged with such revision "based on thorough factual studies by a broadly representative group of experts, including physicians, economists, sociologists, psychologists, and lawyers." In the opinion of the DAV the primary responsibility for revising the VA rating schedule should be left in the hands of those technicians who understand it, who work with it every day and who have made necessary studies including research into industrial data before promulgating a schedule and any extension or revision used in the adjudication of compensation and pension claims. It is an appalling thought to try and imagine what sort of a schedule would issue from the efforts of an outside group with such diverse backgrounds and ignorance of all that goes into the production of a necessarily complex rating schedule, as evidently contemplated by this recommendation. It is a most difficult task even for highly trained and experienced technicians to construct a satisfactory rating schedule and if anyone should desire to create a chaotic condition in the VA, and thereby in all veteranism, we know of no better way than to bring in an outside group, such as the one proposed, no matter how highly educated, trained, and skilled in their own fields, and put them to work on preparing a VA rating schedule.

Re paragraph (b): In the paragraphs immediately preceding and following recommendation No. 10, it is made clear that the Commission is in favor of abolishing statutory awards. They stress the idea of paying veterans equally for equal disability. They forget, or never knew of the legislative processes leading to the adoption of the various statutory awards after hearings and the introduction of medical and lay evidence in support thereof. The statutory awards made a part of the laws proved to be a practical solution to a problem that has faced the VA and the Congress since during World War I. If the statutory awards are eliminated how could the Government possibly compensate certain maimed or badly disabled veterans with any degree of justice? Certainly it could not be done through any one regular rating schedule and if more than one schedule is employed then it would be simpler and better to retain the statutory awards and the present machinery to pay them.

Recommendation No. 11 (p. 174): In this recommendation, as in some others, it is noted that the Bradley Commission opens with a fair statement and then proceeds to use the word "but" followed by proposals that are not acceptable to this organization. We are unalterably opposed to the idea expressed that the veterans with the lower compensation ratings are overpaid nor is the proposal made that a still further proportional disparity be authorized between the lower and the upper rates, acceptable. As I stated to your committee on March 21, 1956, we favor increases for all the compensation evaluations and in addition desire to see that the percent ratios are brought in line and with the veterans rated less than 50 percent allowed to draw additional compensation for wife, children and dependent parents in proportional amounts, as is now the case where the ratings are 50 percent or

higher. We will have more to say about the 10 percent and 20 percent cases in commenting upon the next succeeding recommendation. With reference to the proposal that there be several graduations "depending upon the extent of helplessness" it would seem that this attempt to make such a fine distinction would present administrative difficulties in its application and would open the door to charges of discrimination in the adjudication of claims in cases involving applications for nurse and attendant allowance.

Recommendation No. 12 (p. 177): This organization is opposed to paying off even low rated so-called static cases through a lump sum or short term settlement and, moreover, it is not believed that such attempt would be to the best interest to the Government. Even many static disabilities can and do become aggravated and as rates of compensation are increased from time to time by congressional enactment this group of veterans, or some of them, would undoubtedly become dissatisfied and bring pressure to bear to open up their cases. It would seem from the wording of this recommendation and the explanatory material presented by the Bradley Commission in its support that little disability is credited as being present in cases rated 10 or 20 percent. The DAV does not subscribe to that impression, as we have observed through long experience many instances where the disabilities were not truly minor in their effect upon the mental and physical well-being of the individuals concerned although rated only 10 or 20 percent in accordance with the terms of the rating schedule. As far as a review is concerned the VA for many months has been engaged in a review of running award cases and this, of course, includes those cases rated 10 and 20 percent. Some instances have been detected where veterans should have been granted higher ratings and, whatever adjustments were found in order, appropriate action has been and is being accomplished.

Recommendation No. 13 (p. 178): The DAV opposes with all possible energy the recommendation that the presumptive provisions of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, tuberculosis, and multiple sclerosis, be withdrawn. The view of the Commission that accepted medical principles can reasonably and accurately establish the onset of a disease and a disability process is almost humorously contrary to the experience of this organization gained in handling many thousands of compensation cases. I am equally sure that such views are contrary to the experience of the members of your committee. What are the accepted medical principles as to the origin of multiple sclerosis, leprosy, and a host of other diseases where medical science has not progressed to the point where it can determine the cause, let alone the date of inception? As your committee must be aware, either through long personal experience as Members of Congress, or through study of the old records, physicians of eminence and ability have appeared and given favorable testimony in regard to the authorization of presumptions for certain classes of diseases. It is conceded that there are many physicians who are in opposition and at a recent hearing before your committee a past president of the American Medical Association went on record as opposing any presumptions. This would seem to be the case once again where physicians cannot agree among themselves and it is obvious that many of them are merely following the AMA line. In this connection, the AMA Washington Letter 84-70, dated April 27, 1956, on page 1, under The Week in Washington states as follows: "The Bradley Commission's findings on non-service-connected VA care in many respects are just what the AMA has been saying for a long time." On page 2 of that same letter, specific reference is made to the Commission

recommendation for withdrawal of the presumptions. It may be added that the term "accepted medical principles" was found to be so controversial even among doctors that the VA Claim Service some years ago forbade the use of the term in writing veterans and their representatives about disallowances of compensation cases. It is not believed that further argument on this recommendation is necessary as it is inconceivable that your committee would approve such an unfair and improper proposal.

Recommendation No. 14 (p. 181): This would gear the rates for disability compensation to the prevailing average of national earnings "by some representative group of workers." What group of workers, may we ask? And just how would the proposal be carried out to bring about a review of the actual rates paid every 2 years and adjustment made to conform with such standards? This, to us, is an impractical, visionary scheme that would break down of its own weight and the insuperable and administrative difficulties, if attempted. In paragraph (b) of the proposal that the rate of compensation payable to veterans who are actually disabled be two-thirds of the average earnings in the group selected as standard is not only impractical but would probably result in reductions in cases where the veterans are now receiving compensation on 100 percent rating plus statutory awards.

Recommendation No. 15 (p. 183): In the opinion of this organization the implementation of this proposal would be detrimental to veterans and would probably result in the lowering in their standards of payment. As to (b) there is present machinery for preventing duplicate benefit payments for the same disability as witness the agreement between the VA and the Federal Employees Compensation activity. The injection of OASI into the picture to the degree apparently desired by the Commission is not acceptable.

Recommendation No. 16 (p. 185): The DAV is in agreement with this proposal.

Recommendation No. 17 (p. 190): With reference to paragraphs (a) and (b) the procedures mentioned would seem to be desirable if not precluded by cost or other deterrent considerations; however, paragraph (c) with its insistence upon medical or surgical treatment as a condition precedent to payment of compensation is not only considered unreasonable but would probably be impossible of attainment by reason of the volume of cases and lack of personnel.

Recommendation No. 18 (p. 196): This organization does not endorse the idea advanced herein and questions the necessity for the study to be made under the guidance of a Cabinet subcommittee.

#### CHAPTER VII

Recommendation No. 20 (p. 205): The DAV does not believe the establishment of dependency should be required in the case of wives (widows) and minor children.

Recommendation No. 36 (p. 225): The proposal that, whenever legally possible, the premium rates for Government life insurance include a charge to cover the administrative costs is not believed to be a desirable provision.

#### CHAPTER IX

Recommendation No. 46 (p. 319): This organization is definitely opposed to any weakening of the Veterans' Preference Act and, accordingly, does not subscribe to the views of the Commission on the subject as presented in this recommendation.

#### CHAPTER X

Recommendation No. 47 (p. 333): This organization has earnestly considered the recommendation that the compensation rates in peacetime cases should be the same as the disability and death compensation rates as to those who served in wartime. As long as men are being taken in the Armed Forces



via the draft the DAV has no objection to the proposal stated in this recommendation.

#### CHAPTER XI

Recommendation No. 57 (p. 373): The fact that the DAV is primarily interested and active in the case of the war disabled, their widows, children, and dependents, does not mean that we as an organization are willing to stand idly by while the pension structure that has been erected through the years is dismantled. The position of this organization as to the pension program was outlined to your committee by the national commander on February 29, 1956, at which time he said in part: "I am sure this committee recognizes the fact that the Disabled American Veterans is unique among the veterans organizations in that from the beginning our purpose, and our sole objective has been devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the conditions, health and interest of all wounded, gassed, injured and disabled veterans, and to aid and assist worthy wartime disabled veterans, their widows, their orphans and their dependents. . . . We soon found that remembering our sworn obligations and confining our efforts to the care of the disabled, his widow and dependents was a great task or mission. It was all we could handle. The DAV has never registered any protest to existing part III benefits—the payment of a pension where the veteran became permanently and totally disabled and unable to carry on continuously in gainful occupation and where a reasonable income limitation or evidence of need exists. As stated previously we have not supported such legislation because of our desire and efforts to secure increased awards or amounts for the service-connected veteran and his dependents."

You will recall that on March 20, 1933, there was passed by the Congress Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress, which had the misleading caption "An Act To Maintain the Credit of the United States Government." The monetary purpose was to save \$200 million, all at the expense of veterans and Federal employees. You all know what happened subsequently as numerous benefits then denied, eliminated, or reduced, were restored, some in part. In the meantime, there were some suicides of veterans and widespread misery and hardship. The Bradley Commission report, if adopted, could well have the most unfortunate results and in some instances these would border on the catastrophic. Why should a veteran, otherwise eligible and qualified, be denied a pension because he has social-security income to which he contributed in his active working years, or is in receipt of financial assistance from relatives, or friends, or from other sources, as long as the veteran is permanently and totally disabled to earn a livelihood through his own efforts, meets all the service and other requirements, and has a computable annual income less than the amounts specified by law? No, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, we do not endorse the plea for increases of pension and liberalization of criteria embodied in the bills before you this session; we most certainly do not favor the retrogressive movement away from existing national policy as advocated by the Bradley Commission. That might well prove to be the opening wedge that would place the compensation legislative structure in jeopardy and spearhead a subsequent attempt to tie in the compensation program to "needs," the word that runs like a thread through the tapestry of the New Look advocated so strongly by the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

Recommendation No. 58 (p. 375): See comments on recommendation 57.

Recommendation No. 59 (p. 384): See above comments on recommendations 57 and 58.

Recommendation No. 60 (pp. 388, 389): Opposed. See foregoing comments on preceding recommendations.

Recommendation No. 61 (pp. 390, 391): We are not in favor of imposing any restrictions curtailing or modifying the present laws and regulations on this subject.

Recommendation No. 62 (p. 392): Opposed—see above.

#### CHAPTER XII

Recommendation No. 63 (p. 396): The DAV does not agree with this proposal. It should continue to be within the province of the VA to determine, under its controlling criteria and precedents, whether a veteran with an undesirable or bad-conduct discharge was released from service under conditions and for acts constituting discharge under dishonorable conditions.

Recommendation No. 64 (p. 397): See above comment under recommendation No. 63.

Recommendation No. 65 (p. 398): There have been studies made in the past relative to this subject. The record is probably voluminous and it is not known what is to be gained by another thorough study. The facts are clear as to what the law and VA regulations permit and even direct to be done about payments where veterans are receiving hospital or domiciliary care at public expense or while inmates of penal institutions, and it would seem that any question now raised would be one purely of future policy.

#### CHAPTER XIII

Recommendation No. 66 (pp. 402-403): This organization is in agreement with paragraph (a) but looks upon paragraph (b) with a skeptical eye. This may be a meritorious proposal, depending upon the persons selected, their background, character and philosophy where veterans are concerned, but we are not convinced that it would have any good results. As to paragraph (c) it is believed that the VA staff activities are now overrun with specialists in planning, analysis, program reviewing, office managements, etc., to such an extent that the VA is losing, or has lost sight of the more important functions such as rendering the best possible service to veterans and their dependents, the sympathetic consideration of claims on the basis of human problems, and the proper professional attitude of all officers and employees having the responsibility for making decisions affecting veterans and their dependents. There are some who believe that the chief aims of the VA too often are (1) public relations, (2) statistical and (3) work-measurement or assembly-line techniques.

Recommendation No. 67 (pp. 404, 405): The proposal to make the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a member of the President's Cabinet has appealing aspects but could very well turn out to be a mirage, regardless of the individuals involved. As a member of the Cabinet the Administrator could be subjected to statistical arguments of depressing nature with possible intimation from higher quarters that might well interfere with conclusions reached by him if made independently and without being in the higher echelon atmosphere at the time. In addition, the Administrator, as a Cabinet member, would undoubtedly be asked for his opinion on a wide variety of subjects only indirectly affecting veterans or not at all and it is hardly conceivable that he would decline to express his views on political matters if requested to do so. As to establishing a Cabinet Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, with the Administrator as a special member, the necessity for such another new group at the high level indicated is not apparent and is not endorsed as the matter now stands. If the idea stated in paragraph (c) means what we think it might mean then the DAV can be recorded as opposed.

Recommendation No. 68 (p. 406): The preceding recommendation would make the Administrator a Cabinet member to enhance his prestige and responsibility, whereas recommendation No. 68 would place additional limitations on his authority and require him to give advance notice and obtain advance review by "appropriate agencies of the Government" whenever he issues rules in large matters affecting eligibility of veterans for benefits or involving changes in program objectives. It is not very clear just what is intended here, but from the descriptive material preceding this recommendation we would be opposed to the change.

Recommendation No. 69 (p. 408): While there may be some justification for this proposal, it is wondered if the Commission had any real comprehension as to the large number of additional qualified employees that would be required and the very substantial increased cost involved to set up and maintain such high-salaried reviewing officials thereby constituting an intermediate step between decisions of the rating boards and appellate determinations of the Board of Veterans' Appeals. If Congress, in its wisdom, desires to authorize the establishment of what, in effect, would be Intermediate Appeals Board, regardless of the many new positions that would need to be created and staffed at the great cost involved, then this organization has nothing to say either in favor or in opposition.

Recommendation No. 70 (p. 409): It is believed that this recommendation if carried into effect would be helpful and this organization, generally, will be found favorable to any codification or reasonable simplification of the laws affecting veterans and the related regulations.

In the conclusion on page 410 of the Bradley Commission report the statement is made that the VA has been examined many times by outside management experts and Government bodies, also that it has been administratively reorganized a number of times. The Commission concludes that this had had some salutary effect, but that the "shifting of organization charts has long since been discredited as a panacea for the ills of governmental administration." It is hoped that the officials in charge of the VA fully realize this truism and will profit by it. The DAV is concerned with the many surveys that have been made of the VA, the too frequent internal reorganizations that have been imposed, the stress and strain upon the personnel, much of it resulting from changes, experiments, and generally ill-considered moves of one kind or another, and the greatly impaired morale that must inevitably accompany such basic insecurity and feelings of frustration. Nothing was very much wrong with the operation of the VA, but it certainly is now or will be unless there is a cessation or let-up in the investigatorial and critical activities that have seemingly started on the false premise that something is radically wrong with the VA that can only be remedied by drastic surgery and a prolonged and stormy convalescence. Perhaps these remarks are beside the point of this hearing, but, in my judgment, someone should make them publicly and as we are all working toward the same end—the welfare of the veterans and their families—I thought you would not be averse to hearing the truth as we see it.

I desire to express my sincere thanks for your kindness and courtesy in hearing this rather lengthy dissertation on the many items covered in the Bradley Commission report. It is hoped that our comments will be helpful to you and in conclusion may I say that we as an organization still support the bills that were commented upon favorably by us at previous hearings and in correspondence and that we do not discern after careful study of the Bradley Commission findings any good reason for changing our position as heretofore announced. Thank you again for hearing me out.

## KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I sent a cablegram to Josef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of the Communist Polish People's Republic. This cablegram read:

As the Congressman who introduced the original resolution in the House of Representatives during the 82d Congress calling for an investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre of thousands of Polish Army officers and intellectual leaders, and who served as a member of the select congressional committee which was established to conduct a full and complete investigation of this international crime, I should like to make available to you and the special group which your Government is reported to have recently authorized to investigate the mass murders at Katyn, all the evidence heard by and submitted to our committee in 1951 and 1952. I would also be happy to come to Poland as a witness to elaborate upon and substantiate the facts and conclusions reported by our investigating committee.

I have been prompted to send this cablegram because of the recent news developments in both Russia and Poland. The new look in Russia is seen in denunciations of the late Dictator Stalin by the present leaders in Russia, wherein they are now criticizing him for his purge of 5,000 Soviet officers before World War II.

The present Communist-dominated Polish Government and its press and radio are following the same line.

Recent developments in Poland reveal the Polish Government is planning to free over 30,000 political prisoners, is planning to make payments to compensate people unjustly sent to jail, has promised restoration of pensions and honors to the survivors of the heroic non-Communist Polish home army, and most recently has been reported to have begun a new investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre.

I hope this new investigation by the Russian-dominated Polish Government will be as unbiased, fair, and complete as was the investigation by our select committee in the 82d Congress.

When the German armies occupied the Smolensk area in 1943 they discovered the mass graves of Polish Army officers and blamed the Russians for this massacre. When the Russian Army recaptured this area in 1944 it set up a commission to reinvestigate these mass murders and blamed it on the German Army. No complete and thorough investigation of this matter occurred until the 82d Congress authorized a special committee to investigate the facts. This select committee, after complete hearings, revealed authoritatively the information we had in our State Department files and in Army Intelligence files, which, with all the other supporting evidence gathered both in America and in Europe, caused the select committee to come to the unanimous conclusion that the mass murder of Polish Army officers and intellectuals was decreed by the Russian Communist rulers and carried out by the Soviet NKVD—People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs.

It is my hope that this Polish committee will invite all interested witnesses to be heard, similar to the practice adopted by our select committee. Our committee had extended an invitation to the Russian Government to present its evidence, which invitation was not accepted.

I feel certain that an unbiased investigation will confirm the findings of our congressional committee, in that the orders to perpetrate this heinous crime on the Polish people came directly from Dictator Stalin and the bosses in the higher echelon of the Communist Party.

In presenting the facts of the Katyn massacre to the Polish people, I hope the Communist Polish People's Republic will denounce Stalin and all top Russian officials who aided or abetted this crime against humanity.

I, and I assume the rest of the members of the Select Committee To Investigate the Facts and Circumstances Surrounding the Katyn Forest Massacre, would be more than willing to present and elaborate on the evidence heard by our committee.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to express my complete sympathy with the aims of the gentleman, but I rise particularly to commend him for his own efforts on behalf of the Poles behind the Iron Curtain. I have followed with interest and carefully for some time the efforts of the gentleman to bring out the true facts in the case of the Katyn Forest massacre. I am certainly sure that the people of the gentleman's district should applaud him for his zeal and for his consecration and for his continued interest.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I wish also to commend the gentleman on his fine statement. I would like to point out to him that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and I have already offered resolutions which would ask the Department of State to make available the records of the Katyn committee, of which the gentleman from Illinois and I were members. I sincerely trust that the Department of State will avail themselves of the opportunity and present to the so-called Polish Government, the Communist regime in Poland, the evidence which will undoubtedly prove to them, as it has proven to the rest of the world, that the Communists were guilty of the murder at the Katyn Forest.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I want to let the gentleman know that the Republican members on the committee, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. DONDERO, and myself have joined with you and Mr. MADDEN in submitting a similar resolution.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to Mr. DE-ROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), through May 11, 1956, on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS and to include an address delivered by Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$187.

Mr. COLE in two instances and that the remarks of Mr. O'BRIEN of New York immediately follow his remarks, both to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. SCRIVNER in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. DAGE.

Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. SIKES) and to include a letter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT to include in his remarks on the public library services bill certain documents and communications.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous remarks.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous remarks.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIDSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICHARDS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1824. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Bureau of Mines for the calendar year January 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955, pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, Public Law 552, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1825. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1826. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1827. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the



court's opinion relative to the claim of *Frank C. Torti v. The United States* (Congressional No. 4-52), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 559, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1828. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 16th Annual Report, pursuant to section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 426. Resolution providing for the printing of certain proceedings in the House Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means; without amendment (Rept. No. 2114). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 456. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of material relating to the Central Valley project of California, and additional copies for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2115). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 454. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of conducting studies, investigations, and inquiries incurred by the Select Committee on the Baltic States and by the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2116). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 468. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to employ one additional employee; without amendment (Rept. No. 2117). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 448. Resolution providing for the employment of 15 additional privates, Capitol Police force, office of the Sergeant at Arms; without amendment (Rept. No. 2118). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 465. Resolution to provide for the adjustment of the trust fund account in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms; with amendment (Rept. No. 2119). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 500. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10986, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2120). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 10230. A bill to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 503. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4090, a bill to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an auto-

matic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2122). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 11075. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11076. A bill to permit producers to donate surplus wheat to religious organizations, without payment of marketing penalty, where such donation will divert the wheat from normal trade channels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11077. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 11078. A bill to amend section 6 of act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 11079. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 11080. A bill to establish a permanent Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11081. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 11082. A bill to establish an additional position of inspector of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place a maximum limitation on the 3 percent tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 11084. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 11085. A bill to protect consumers and others against failure to identify, misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 11086. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11087. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases

in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 11088. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the matching formulas for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11089. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

H. R. 11090. A bill concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 11091. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 11092. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain severance pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 11094. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11095. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11096. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 619. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation and study of the production, transportation, distribution, and sale of refined petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 501. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. Res. 502. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to exert their efforts and influence to combat the great inequities aimed at the veterans of this country as enumerated in the recently released Bradley Commission report; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the wasteful expenditures of the Hellum Division of the United States Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 11097. A bill for the relief of Chien-Wu Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 11098. A bill for the relief of Maloney Real Estate Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 11099. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Gucho-Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11100. A bill for the relief of Sverre Augestad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 11101. A bill for the relief of Carolina Rosa Garcao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 11102. A bill for the relief of Yun Yong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11103. A bill for the relief of Matilda Rajkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11104. A bill for the relief of Henrik Mannerfrid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 11105. For the relief of Domenico Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1007. By Mr. DAGUE: Petition of Adam Erb Mummaw and 44 other residents of Lancaster, Pa., and vicinity urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1008. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Peter D. Nagel and 31 other residents of Mason City, Iowa, and vicinity urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1009. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Paul J. Bauer and 5,883 other residents of Cincinnati, Dayton, Columbus, Hamilton, Jamestown, Wilmington, Cedarville, Xenia, West Milton, Laura, Vandalia, Englewood, Ludlow Falls, Potsdam, Union, Spring Valley, Bellbrook, Thornville, Sabina, Williamsburg, Morrow, Bowersville, Malvern, Waynesburg, Delaware, Centerville, Hillsboro, Rushville, Ashland, Madeira, Lebanon, Alliance, Louisville, Carrollton, Middletown, Athens, Chillicothe, Columbiana, Glouster, Sebring, Napoleon, Greenfield, Frankfort, Warren, Sunbury, Philadelphia, Portsmouth, Findlay, Salem, Defiance, Pomeroy, Marion, New Concord, and other towns and cities in Ohio, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Kansas City, Kans., Armory Dedication

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the following news story from the Kansas City Star, of Sunday, May 6, 1956, relates the events of a historic day in Kansas City, Kans., when the city's new million-dollar National Guard armory was dedicated.

As you will see, the story gives short excerpts from talks given by Gen. Williston B. Palmer, Army Vice Chief of Staff; former President Harry S. Truman; and myself:

LINK IN DEFENSE: THE NEW KANSAS CITY, KANS., NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY IS DEDICATED AS DETERRENT OF WAR—REPRESENTATIVE SCRIVNER SAYS THE FACILITY IS EVIDENCE OF THE WILL TO FACE ENEMIES

In a ceremony replete with military honors and traditions, the new National Guard armory in Kansas City, Kans., was dedicated yesterday before 2,000 persons.

The event drew to the city former President Harry S. Truman, 18 generals, including the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Williston B. Palmer, and other Midwest military and civilian leaders.

Special tribute was paid to Col. Mahlon S. Weed, station commander, for his work of more than two decades to provide the city such a facility. Colonel Weed's reply was a simple "Thank you," and words of praise for the citizens of the community who made the million-dollar project possible.

## TRIBUTE TO COLONEL WEED

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Representative in Congress from the Second Kansas District, who

served as a lieutenant under the colonel when he was Captain Weed, paid this tribute:

"It is more than a building we dedicate today. It is a dream come true, a testimonial to the vision, tenacity, and faith of one man, Col. Mahlon S. Weed."

The Representative recalled the history of the guard in Kansas City, Kans., pointing out such inadequate facilities of bygone years as a laundry converted to armory use, store-fronts, and the basement of the Memorial hall.

"Today you see the culmination of years of effort," SCRIVNER said. "On this ground stands, by your efforts, this magnificent armory, in which the youth of today and tomorrow will receive training \* \* \* that may some day not only save their own lives, but may very well save your country and your life."

## HISTORIC ROLE BY CITIZEN

The speaker added that tax dollars for the armory are as a premium on an insurance policy for national security. He recalled the efforts of the citizen-soldier called to arms in all of America's wars and pointed out that the National Guard and Reserve forces furnish the major share of military manpower when war comes.

"With these marvelous modern facilities, our men will be far better prepared than they could have been otherwise," SCRIVNER said. "Even so, I am sure you join me in the prayer that even though prepared, they will never be called upon to serve in time of war. With them, let this be your slogan, 'Keep your guard up.'"

The importance of the civilian components in the Nation's military picture also was stressed by Gen. Williston B. Palmer, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, who was representing Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Chief of Staff. General Palmer congratulated the citizens of Kansas City, Kans., for their efforts in providing the facility.

## A PREPAREDNESS SYMBOL

"In generously providing this building," the general said, "the people of this city and

of this State are to be commended. This is visible evidence of your determination to deter war, and the National Guard men here are likewise dedicated to this purpose. The significance of this ceremony is that we are dedicating not merely a shrine to memories of past wars, but also a building to house the strength with which to boldly face our enemies, and which by its readiness will prevent conflict.

General Palmer was introduced by Maj. Gen. Joe Nickell, the adjutant general of Kansas.

Truman recalled his early days in the guard, telling of the payment of 25 cents a night to rent a dance hall as a drill hall, and providing a uniform.

The country has found out that the National Guard and the Reserve must be maintained," Mr. Truman said. "I am very much interested in what you are doing here. It is necessary that the country understands that its welfare depends on the civil population."

## A WORD TO GUARDSMEN

Turning to the guardsmen the former President counseled the men they should appreciate the facility they now have.

"Keep up the good work," he said, "you're the only safety this country has."

Beaming, Mr. Truman remarked as he finished: "I want to come back in about 20 years when I'm 90 to review you and see if you have shown any improvement."

In presenting the armory to the State, Mayor Paul F. Mitchum said it was a real pleasure for him to represent the citizenry of Kansas City, Kans., in the task. Gen. Calvin E. Berry, Topeka, a member of the State military board, accepted the facility and said:

"I express the deep appreciation of the Kansas Military Board to the citizens of this community for their untiring devotion to our national defense."

Brig. Gen. Frank Dunkley, Topeka, formally commissioned the armory as a military facility. Accepting the responsibility of the building for Colonel Weed, the station commander, was Lt. Col. John W. Breidenthal, executive officer of the station.



## Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth" by Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, before the 44th annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Statler Hotel, May 1, 1956:

In the decade since the end of the Second World War, the American economy has dramatically demonstrated the vigor of its basic growth-generating forces. Apart from the mild recession of 1949 and the drop in 1954, the Nation's economic growth has been remarkably steady. For the decade as a whole, the private economy has grown at an annual rate of about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  percent in constant 1955 prices.

One of the most important factors in this growth is the character of the people of this country. Our perpetual dissatisfaction with present achievements, our alertness in recognizing problems and our welcome acceptance of the challenge they present, and the nearly universal conviction that better ways of living are to be had if we apply the proper effort, imagination, and creativeness in our undertakings—these attitudes are the well springs from which our material progress flows. Our spirit is that of the quest; the rewards to that spirit are daily unfolded before us.

The economy's performance since the end of World War II confirms the importance of sound public policy in providing the setting in which this spirit can impel our private-enterprise economy to new achievements. An instrument of this public policy has been the Employment Act of 1946 and the executive and congressional machinery which it established.

Recently, the Tax Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report concluded an intensive study of the impact of the Federal tax system on the economic development of the Nation. Drawing on this study, I should like to suggest certain economic principles for Federal tax policy and offer some suggestions as to the nature of the revisions necessary for a more rigorous observance of these principles in our tax law.

## THE LEVEL OF TAX REVENUES

In the fiscal year 1955, the Federal Government's net budget receipts amounted to \$60.3 billion. On the basis of recent information it now seems that net receipts for fiscal 1956 may run as much as \$3 billion greater than the \$64.5 billion estimated in January of this year. During the past 10 fiscal years, the people and businesses of this country have paid to the Federal Government \$494.1 billion. I mention this staggering amount only to remove any doubt you might have that I am perfectly well aware of the fact that taxes are high.

In recent years, we have become increasingly aware of the fact that a close relationship exists between the amount of money the Federal Government collects and spends and the level of activity in the economy as a whole. Although we still maintain that the basic purpose of taxation is to raise revenue to finance expenditures, we also recognize the fact that when Federal Government activities represent one-fifth of the

national income, the manner in which those activities are financed will have significant economic consequences.

It is generally agreed, for example, that when the private economy is not fully using available resources, reducing taxes relative to spending will have a stimulating effect. It is also generally agreed that when the economy is pressing hard on available resources, increasing taxes relative to spending will help to repress inflationary pressures. Once the level of Government spending has been determined, changing the level of tax receipts is an effective way to minimize economic fluctuations. We cannot afford to neglect this important tool, since these fluctuations represent significant obstacles to the attainment of our objective of steady economic growth. Recessionary movements interrupt the process of growth by leaving some of our growing resources idle, while inflation makes continued growth more difficult to maintain.

Our first principle, therefore, is that the level of taxes should be related to the level of Government expenditures by the need for full use of growing productive resources and stability in the general price level. In practice, this means that we should move in the direction of reducing deficits or increasing budget surpluses during times of inflationary pressure, using at least some of our surplus for purposes of reducing debt. In times of recession, on the other hand, we should not be reluctant to move in the direction of deficits if these are needed to maintain full employment.

It now appears that we may well end fiscal year 1956 with a budget surplus as much as \$2 billion, considerably in excess of the \$200 million estimated for the year in the President's January budget message. The suggestion has been made that a budget surplus of this size makes possible, in fact requires, tax reduction. I am sure no one will argue with the point of view that, all other things being equal, tax reduction is a desirable course of action. We should bear in mind, however, that this healthy budget surplus is primarily the automatic result of the sharp rise in personal and corporation incomes in 1955 and not the result of corresponding reductions in expenditures. If, as it appears likely to many, that rise should resume during the course of the year, devoting any substantial portion of the budget surplus to tax reduction might well result in strong inflationary pressures which would cancel out, through price increases and general economic instability, the benefits from lower tax liabilities. It is possible, of course, that as we go further into 1956, the prospects for continued economic expansion may weaken. If persistent economic weakness should appear, tax reduction to stimulate private demand would be entirely appropriate.

Some maintain that top priority should be given to tax reduction lest continuation of present high rates destroy the spirit of quest which I have identified as a prime source of our Nation's growth and development. The actual growth record of the economy over the past decade, coinciding with the highest peacetime tax rates we have ever known, I believe, shows that this danger has been exaggerated. Present tax rates are certainly too high for the long run. At the present time, however, I am more concerned about the short-run inflationary dangers in premature or ill-timed tax reduction.

One might well ask, "If we cannot provide tax reduction now, with a budget surplus of the size now anticipated, and with the country at peace, what hope for tax cuts is there?" I think the chances for tax reduction are excellent. If we exercise the proper fiscal responsibility and integrity, if we insist that Federal tax policy reflect the need for avoiding both inflation and recession, these chances will be greatly enhanced. If we succeed in moderating short-run economic fluctuations, we can count on a steady

growth over the next decade which will make possible substantial reductions in effective Federal tax rates.

## RESPONSIVENESS OF THE FEDERAL REVENUE SYSTEM TO ECONOMIC FLUCTUATIONS

The legislative record of the postwar decade demonstrates the willingness of the Congress to make adjustments in fiscal and monetary policy to offset recessionary and inflationary movements, once these movements are recognized. However, a considerable period may elapse between the time economic disturbances get under way and the time adequate objective evidence with respect to their character and direction is available. The Congress cannot be expected to legislate significant changes in, say, individual income tax rates on the basis of forecasts of short-run economic fluctuations. It must wait until a basic need for such changes is clear. During this lag, however, the economic disturbances may gain considerable momentum, thereby increasing the difficulties in taking appropriate action. To the extent that our fiscal and monetary system contains automatic features for offsetting fluctuations, the problems of economic stabilization facing the Congress and the administration are reduced.

Our present tax system contains a number of such features. Chief among these are the individual and corporation income taxes. Other elements of the Federal revenue system respond sluggishly to changes in national income. In the interests of strengthening the automatic countercyclical responsiveness of the tax system, therefore, we should avoid tax changes which would weaken our income taxes and force heavier reliance on other elements in the revenue system. For example, proposals for shifting to a general manufacturer's sales tax to finance income-tax reductions or to impose constitutional limitations on income-tax rates, thereby requiring relatively greater use of consumption taxes, not only would violate generally held concepts of fairness but would represent a serious threat to economic stability.

The automatic stabilizing capacity of income taxes depends on the size and composition of the tax base, the degree of effective progression in the tax-rate structure, and the promptness with which tax payments are made. In all but the last respect there is considerable room for improving the built-in flexibility of the income taxes.

For example, only about 40 percent of what the Department of Commerce describes as personal income enters the individual income-tax base, and some of the types of income which are most sensitive to broad changes in economic conditions are not fully subject to tax. Of course, considerations other than those of strengthening built-in flexibility must be taken into account in determining the appropriate tax treatment of various kinds of income and expense. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that a tax proposal which would have the effect of partially or fully sheltering income from tax will involve a cost—perhaps a significant one—in reducing the capacity of the tax system automatically to damp down undesirable economic fluctuations.

Very considerable improvements can be made in increasing the effective progression of the tax-rate structure. We have heard a great deal in recent years about the allegedly pernicious effects of income-tax progression on incentives and, therefore, on economic growth. This question, among others, was carefully explored last year in the study conducted by the Subcommittee on Tax Policy. Taking full account of the testimony of the most extreme critics of the present tax structure, it is fair to report as the conclusion of this study that most of the criticism of the individual income tax is not properly directed against progression per se, but rather against the level of the whole rate schedule.

The study also revealed, by reference to statistics from tax returns, that effective progression in the individual income tax is considerably less than that suggested by the statutory tax-rate schedules. At the present time, for example, less than one-fifth of individual income-tax revenues is produced by marginal rates above the first bracket. Moreover, when full allowance is made for all the income received by the taxpayer, the data show that for individuals with adjusted gross incomes over \$100,000 effective rates varied, in 1951, from 37 to 68 percent and averaged about 45 percent.

These data suggest to me that we can greatly strengthen effective progression in the individual income tax, and thereby fortify the ability of the tax to counteract economic fluctuations, without increasing the level of individual income taxes. In fact, if it were possible to broaden the tax base, we could both increase progression and lower tax rates at the same time. There are, admittedly, substantial difficulties in pursuing this objective, but the rewards would be very great indeed.

#### THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM AND BALANCED ECONOMIC GROWTH

The excellent postwar record of the American economy in maintaining steady growth is due, in large part, to the fact that we have maintained an approximate balance between consumer expenditures and capital outlays. When this balance is upset, economic difficulties quickly follow. A rate of growth in consumption in excess of investment results in a faltering in the rise in living standards because of the failure of productive capacity to keep pace with the expansion of consumption needs. On the other hand, too rapid a rate of capital formation means sacrifices of current living standards and threatens idle capacity and disorganization of further growth. Imbalance between consumption and investment, therefore, can be a seriously destabilizing development.

On the whole, the Federal tax system has contributed toward maintaining an appropriate balance between consumption and investment. Both business and consumers have had to forego—over the last decade—some of the gains that would have been possible had the world been less troubled by international tensions and conflicts. But the sacrifice has not been markedly one-sided. In the interests of continuing economic growth and stability in the present environment of world affairs, we want to avoid unsettling shifts in tax burdens.

I do not mean to suggest that any adjustment in relative tax burdens would be unwarranted. There are numerous ways in which our tax system can and should be modified to provide a fairer distribution of the total tax load. Such adjustments are always timely, given due regard to their revenue effects. I do mean to caution against broad shifts in the balance between consumption and investment impacts of taxation which do not accord with basic economic requirements. Relatively heavier tax burdens on consumers in order to ease taxes on business would clearly not be in order when slackening economic growth is associated with lagging consumer demand and idle plant and equipment. By the same token, we would want to avoid heavier relative tax burdens on business at a time when rising consumer demand was inadequate to induce the desired rate of growth in industrial capacity.

Balanced economic growth also requires that taxes fall as neutrally as possible among all taxpayers. It is in this respect that I believe the maxim about taxation for revenue purposes only is most meaningful, for the use of tax devices to effect particular economic results is, on the whole, a dangerous policy to pursue. The present tax law

is replete with preferential provisions for special tax-paying groups and measures up poorly to the standard of neutrality.

A common characteristic of these preferential provisions is that they tend to induce taxpayers to use the resources at their disposal in a different manner from that which would be called for by prudent management in both business and personal life. We pride ourselves on the effectiveness with which the price system, operating in free markets, acts to signal consumers, investors, and managers to use their resources in the most efficient way possible. Special tax provisions often introduce considerations which are at variance with the signals of the market place. If the benefits from these special tax provisions are great enough, they may outweigh market considerations. The result will be interference in the allocation of resources and therefore a lower total real value for the product of the economy.

Any one of the present preferential provisions, by itself, may well be quite laudable. But we have to recognize that a tax benefit to encourage any one industry or group necessarily means willingness to deter the growth of others not equally favored. Much of the legislative history of our tax system is a reflection of the efforts of some such group to obtain for itself tax concessions similar to those previously extended to another. It is simply a basic fact of our fiscal life that the more preferential treatment we give any one taxpayer or group of taxpayers, the less we can give to all others.

We must also recognize how great a responsibility is assumed in providing preferential tax treatment. These provisions represent value judgments about the type of economic activity most essential to the process of economic growth. This is the very type of decision which virtually all of us feel cannot be safely made except by the impersonal mechanism of the price system.

A fundamental objective in formulating tax policy should be to strive for neutrality and uniformity in the application of our tax laws. Greater uniformity would eliminate or reduce distortions in economic development, provide us a much fairer tax system, and greater automatic responsiveness to changes in levels of economic activity.

#### THE FEDERAL REVENUE SYSTEM AND THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF NEW AND SMALL BUSINESS

Apart from the sentimental attachment that all of us have to new and small businesses, there is, I believe, a sound scientific basis for emphasizing their importance in our economy. They represent often the concrete expression of the creativeness and imagination which are basic resources for economic progress. A constant stream of new businesses is our best assurance that established companies will continue to face the challenges which are so important in the development of new products and new and better production methods. A large number of small businesses is required to insure that control over the use of resources, output, and prices is widely diffused, and therefore that these resources will be most efficiently used.

Tax policy must prevent tax discrimination against small and new business. It must avoid reinforcing those pressures in the economy for the submergence of such businesses, either by failure or by amalgamation with larger business units. The rise in mergers and other consolidations in recent months is one of the factors that suggests the need for reexamination of public policy in this area. Even though these mergers do not necessarily involve small companies, the increasing concentration of business which they frequently produce threatens the continuing independence of small firms. Data on the rate of business failures, over 90 percent of which refers to small businesses, are also cause for concern. The information supplied by the SEC-FTC, while

not conclusive, strongly suggests that small businesses are not sharing the rewards of the current high level of business activity on an equal basis with their larger competitors.

Tax considerations are frequently identified as major factors working against small and new companies. Although it is difficult to determine the significance of these considerations, we must be alert to this type of possibility and scrutinize both the existing tax law and all new tax proposals for their implications in this respect.

To recapitulate, Federal tax policy for steady economic growth should (1) relate the levels of Government revenues and expenditures to the need for full use of growing productive resources and stability in the general price level; (2) strengthen the income tax in order to increase the built-in stabilizing capacity of the Federal tax system. I hasten to add, parenthetically, that this is not to be construed as urging a bigger income-tax bite; (3) maintain a careful balance between those elements of the tax system which rest most heavily on consumption and on investment and seek greater neutrality among taxpayers; and (4) protect the competitive position of small and new businesses.

I would like to outline, very broadly, the type of tax revision implied by these recommendations.

In the individual income tax area there is considerable need for greater effective progression of tax liabilities, particularly in the low- and middle-income range. I mean that the starting rate in many of these brackets is too high. In recent years, about 80 percent of individual returns have been subject to tax at only the first bracket rate. For these taxpayers, progression in effective tax rates depends largely on the number of dependents claimed. A substantial improvement, both in the distribution of tax burdens and in the automatic responsiveness of the tax, would result if ways could be found to split the present first bracket and provide a lower starting rate.

Furthermore I do not believe that the interests of a truly progressive income tax are well served by a marginal rate structure which reaches 91 percent. It has been repeatedly pointed out that these upper rates are largely fictitious. The Statistics of Income for 1952, for example, show that out of 13 million returns with itemized deductions, only 1,279 returns reported taxable income to any part of which the top marginal rate was applicable. That's less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent.

These high rates are part of the vicious circle in which the income tax has been ensnared. When we have rates so high taxpayers make determined efforts to obtain preferential treatment for various types of income and expenses. To the extent that they succeed the tax base shrinks, thereby reinforcing the need for high tax rates. It seems to me, therefore, that we should concentrate on restoring the shrunken tax base while at the same time reducing the top marginal tax rates. These might top off at, say, 65 or 70 percent, depending on how successful efforts to broaden the tax base are.

In this connection high priority should be given to the present treatment of capital gains. Most experts in taxation agree that, because of the taxpayer's control over the realization of capital gains and losses, it would not be practicable or desirable to treat such gains and losses like ordinary income and losses. While recognizing the need for some differential treatment, I think it is highly doubtful that the present preferential treatment is best suited to meet the problems that arise in this tax area. The present treatment offers strong inducements to middle and upper bracket taxpayers to convert ordinary income into capital gains and to seek legislation which extends capital gains treat-



ment to an ever-widening array of receipts. Even a cursory review of the present capital-gains basket reveals a large number of income items which involve neither a capital asset nor a sale or exchange.

The basic problems in the capital gains area are of definition. A determined effort should be made to resolve these problems. At the very least, proposals for further extension of capital-gains treatment as a relief device should be resisted.

In the area of taxation of business income one of the most pressing problems is the treatment of net operating losses. The basic purposes of providing a carryover of net operating business losses appear to be disregarded by the present law which makes these carryovers prime booty acquired in the process of business combination. The transferability of these losses has been a major contributing factor in the recent merger movement. The technical problems in this area are certainly thorny, but revision is urgently required.

Much can be said in favor of the accelerated depreciation provisions included in the 1954 code, although they are not entirely irreplaceable. On the other hand, coupled with capital-gains treatment for gains realized on the sale of assets depreciated under the new provisions, Treasury revenues may seriously suffer, and more important, uneconomic replacement practices are encouraged. Sound economic replacement practices should be encouraged. It would be a highly desirable reform to limit the accelerated depreciation provisions to assets with normal useful lives somewhat greater than the 3 years stipulated in the present statute and to modify the application of capital-gains treatment to depreciable property.

Another problem concerns the appropriate treatment of dividend distributions. We are all aware of the undesirable bias which the present corporation income tax may impose against external equity financing. The individual dividends-received credit and exclusion are not, in the view of most disinterested tax experts, the appropriate approach to the solution of this problem. I think these provisions should be eliminated in favor of some provision at the corporate level for putting dividend and interest payments on a par.

In the excise area, efforts are currently being made to simplify a wide range of technical provisions, primarily relating to compliance and administration. We must begin to give consideration to reduction or elimination of a number of excises which have differentially adverse effects on business-cost structures and competitive relationships. The taxes on transportation, on communications, and on business machines and equipment are cases in point, although not the only ones.

Finally, our estate and gift taxes should be substantially modified. At the present time, they produce only very modest revenues and, therefore, do not well perform the basic function of any tax. Moreover, the structure of these taxes is such as to invite tax avoidance. Even more so than in the case of income taxes, progression in the estate and gift taxes is fictitious. On the other hand, there are other elements of these taxes which contribute toward the merger of small family businesses into large public companies. Revision of our estate and gift taxes should seek to make them more truly progressive, more productive of revenue, and at the same time less biased against family enterprises.

I must acknowledge that I've carved out a large order in my last remarks. We have recently witnessed the magnitude of the undertaking involved in even a comparatively modest revision of our internal-revenue laws. On the other hand, the interests of steady economic growth are more compelling, surely, than consideration of the difficulties involved in large-scale tax revision. This revision is necessary if we are to develop a tax

system which is fair and which conforms to sound economic principles.

As a postscript, I should like to add that the extent to which such revision entails a net loss of revenue to the Government must be given careful consideration in the timing of legislation. I do not know whether it would be possible to undertake these constructive reforms with no net revenue loss. Some tax experts argue affirmatively on this question. If this is not the case, however, we should attempt to gear any revision program to periods in which tax reductions are called for to sustain economic growth. The present economic condition of the country, as I have suggested, does not appear to warrant or even permit any significant reduction in revenues, unless we are willing to impose heavier responsibility on the Federal Reserve System to contain inflationary pressures. Should the economic outlook change, however, we should be ready with a program for general tax revision and reduction. I hope that the discussion today will make some modest contribution in stimulating interest in such a program.

### An Example of Community Action

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 8, 1956*

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States Housing Act of 1954, Public Law 560, calls for citizen participation as a condition for approving any city's request for urban renewal subsidy. Such citizen participation was notably demonstrated in the conference on the Forward Look: The Rehabilitation of the West Side, on May 12, 1956, sponsored by the Riverside Neighborhood Assembly, a school-community council on the West Side of Manhattan, in cooperation with the League of West Side Organizations, the West Side News, and the chamber of commerce. More than 500 citizens and top officials joined hands and minds on the common problems of neighborhood blight to reach areas of agreement and action that will encourage all groups in the community to stay their flight and start to fight for total community improvement.

The principal conference speakers, Commissioner James Felt, Stanley Lowell, assistant to Mayor Wagner, Assemblyman Ludwig Teller, and myself, paid honor to the previous activity of this dynamic community and to its continuing interest and strong bonds of unity. More than 60 religious, civic, and business organizations, including every public school PTA—12—and 10 private schools, cosponsored the conference on the rehabilitation of the West Side. They represented thousands of other west siders who will have submitted to them a complete report of this conference.

The conference technique had been used three times previously by the Riverside Neighborhood Assembly to meet community challenges in other areas: The first, in January 1954, a conference on public education, had widespread influence in informing the public of the

facts and philosophy underlying public education. The formation of a public school affairs committee, still alive and kicking, was only one of many healthy, tangible results. The second, in April 1954, Our New Neighbors—A Community in Transition, courageously faced the bewilderment and hostility engendered by rising tensions due to prejudice, before they could become dangerous. An intercultural committee embracing every school in the area and a youth ambassador to Puerto Rico project became positive factors of integration on the West Side. The third, called the U. N. at Our Door, in cosponsorship with the Foreign Policy Association, presented the community as a grassroots participant in the work of the United Nations.

The fourth and present conference has utilized all the former and added to its numbers and prestige because rehabilitation was everybody's business. The R. N. A. has clearly demonstrated the value of community action by this last, but by no means least, conference on the rehabilitation of the West Side.

### Don't Return Enemy Property

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. W. STERLING COLE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 8, 1956*

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I filed with the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on April 30, 1956, in support of my bill H. R. 80 to authorize the immediate sale of Government-held properties of the General Aniline & Film Corp.:

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity of explaining my reasons for the introduction of H. R. 80, which would amend the Trading With the Enemy Act by authorizing the immediate sale of alien properties after a finding by the President that it is in the national interest to do so and impound the proceeds of the sale until final judicial determination of legal ownership. This bill is identical with one I introduced in the 83d Congress, H. R. 5988.

The principal properties of the General Aniline & Film Corp., a multimillion dollar corporation under the control of the Alien Property Custodian, is located in the district which I represent, and the thousands of employees of that corporation, as well as other residents in that area, are vitally interested in, and affected by, the eventual decision which the Congress will make with respect to the ownership and management of these properties.

Since I first looked into this matter, I was, and still am thoroughly convinced that our Government should get out of the business of operating these industries which were seized at the outbreak of the last world war from our former enemies, Germany and Japan. The employees of the corporation are anxious for the Federal Government to be eliminated and normal private enterprise operations be established so that the company can grow and prosper.

There are two decisions this committee and the Congress must make in this matter: Should the properties be returned to their prewar owners and, in the case of the General Aniline & Film Corp., were the former owners enemy aliens? In the latter issue, our Supreme Court has ruled that, since some of the stockholders of the parent company were German nationals, the status of enemy ownership attached to the entire corporate ownership. Therefore, we can dismiss that issue from our further consideration since it has already been adjudicated by our courts. Our attention can now be centered in the question of whether to return the properties in kind or hold the proceeds in escrow pending settlement of the pending suits. The legality of such procedure seems to be well established according to the brief submitted by the Department of Justice in this matter.

Under existing law, the Government cannot dispose of vested alien properties if the seizure itself is challenged by legal action. In the drafting of the Trading With the Enemy Act that provision was a very fine idea, and unquestionably a very considerate thought—during the heat of the last World War. It was intended to protect those who were not actually our enemies at the time of seizure.

The only trouble with the thought is that the objective could be so easily thwarted because the Germans learned back in World War I how to hide, or cloak, their ownership of various properties. As a result, we have seemingly endless lawsuits with their inherent delays, all to the disadvantage of this country. Delays will continue to consume time until 1 of 2 things happen: either the Congress is softened up by time and pressure until it returns the property to former owners, or our Government loses its lawsuit in the litigation instigated by the claimants, and is required to reconvey the properties. In either event we, the United States Government and the American people, lose.

We should look into history, or the record, on this subject. There we will find that the same influences were at work immediately after World War I as are occurring now. We find that it took the Congress 10 years—from 1922 to 1932—to realize it had made a mistake when it returned the properties held by citizens of our former enemies at the end of World War I. The same parties were involved then as they are now—Germany and the United States.

I sincerely believe that H. R. 80 is the most expeditious form of getting the Government out of the chemical, dye, photographic, and duplicating-machine business in respect to this subject of war reparations of World War II, and at the same time do justice to the former owners. In brief, we would abide by the treaty with our World War II allies (the Paris Reparations Agreement) and, too, the agreement we signed with the Federal Republic of Germany, our former enemy.

Instead of operating these seized industries in question, we would sell them as provided in the Trading With the Enemy Act law, retain the proceeds in our Treasury to await the outcome of any litigation—paying in money those former owners who proved their claims and who were not our enemy.

By passage of H. R. 80, lawsuits could still continue, the qualified and proven claimant would be paid money instead of being handed a going and thriving American company. The Office of Alien Property (the custodian) could be cut back to a litigating agency, and the claims of our own citizens who have been wronged in two world wars could be paid.

I do not think that any of us can deny the fact that as long as these large corporations remain in the hands of our Alien Property Custodian there will be strong pressures and well-financed efforts by the former owners to regain the assets.

Allow me to forecast to you what will happen if these vested assets are returned

to their former owners as is seriously urged upon the Congress by some persons.

A return of these properties would:

1. Require substantial and indefinite appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

2. Reverse the present policy of the United States and its World War II allies with respect to reparations, and deprive this country completely of all reparations.

3. Open up a huge pork barrel to the old enemy cartels without whose backing Hitler could not have forced the world to the very brink of disaster.

4. Provide a gift or windfall of some \$200 million to individuals and organizations, some of whom are not even of German or Japanese nationality.

5. Enable the recapture, through devious means, of the huge business enterprises by the very persons they were taken from—in some instances in both world wars.

6. Endanger the security of secret processes essential to the defense of the United States.

These, as I see it, are the principal objections to a return of the properties. But let us look at these objections more closely.

The first point is appropriations, the cost to us as taxpayers, and I don't need to remind you of the widespread demand these days that taxes be reduced.

The value of all of the vested properties under consideration here is better than a half billion dollars. That is the basic cost figure with which we must begin.

Around \$225 million of these properties have already been liquidated and the moneys transferred to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and disbursed to thousands of our citizens (prisoners of war; internees, both civilian and military; religious organizations, etc.) who were the victims of suffering or damage, one or another, in the last war. So, over \$225 million must be replaced immediately in our Treasury if the policy of property return is adopted.

This is what we might call a downpayment, and that is exactly what it is.

However, all of the property under question here is valued at well over a half billion dollars. This is property now held by the United States Government, and if it is given back, it must be replaced in our Treasury. So with a return we will make the second downpayment of around \$300 million if our Government makes good on its promise to compensate our own citizens for their war damages. Now we are up to the half-billion dollar mark.

And there could be more, much more. For instance, what about enemy property located in the territories of our allies? Under our leadership, all of them seized this enemy property. And they also agreed to retain it. Also, they gave up in return for such retention the right to any other reparations from our former enemies. These are our agreements. We made them.

Now, if we reverse ourselves and return the property we have in our possession, who is going to pay the bill of our allies for the damages which their citizens suffered? Remember, this is our doing. After the United States made these arrangements by international treaties and agreements, our allies certainly had a right to rely on us. So now if we reverse ourselves certainly we will be called upon to pay this additional bill, and maybe we will have to do so.

This will add at least \$300 million to our cost—that is, the amount of property our allies reported to the Interallied Reparations Agency they had seized.

Now our total is over \$800 million—over three-quarters of a billion dollars. That is the price tag attached to the policy of property return. Do you want to buy it? I surely do not.

Now, let us look at the second point, reparations. This is a point that seems to be overlooked generally.

Much has been said in the press and in congressional hearings about the sanctity of

private property—that governments should not seize it—and that such seizure is a complete reversal of our historic policy, followed in World War I—of retaining custody of enemy private property during hostilities, and then returning it after the war is over.

Yes, that is what we did in World War I, but that turned out to be quite a mistake—one that cost the United States billions of dollars. Anyone can be forgiven for making a mistake once, but to make the same mistake twice is both foolish and unpardonable.

After World War I we returned the enemy property we had seized—and received in return Germany's solemn promise that she would pay the war claims of our citizens. Of course, Germany defaulted. We gave up our collateral in return for a scrap of paper. Many of these claims are still unpaid.

Thirty years have passed—another world conflict is history—and in 1953, mind you—just 3 years ago—Germany again solemnly promised to pay these World War I—not World War II—but World War I claims. She says she will do it over a period of 26 years. If she does—I say "if"—some of our citizens will have waited about 56 years for the payment of their claims against Germany.

Will Germany default again? You may say we should not speculate on such a question, but the prospects are not bright you must agree.

World War II is over—the victorious allies met with their defeated enemies—the subject of reparations was under consideration—everyone knew of Germany's default on reparations after World War I—no one wanted that to happen again—so it was agreed that the enemy property that had been seized in the territory of each of the allies, would be retained by them—in lieu of any other reparations payments.

Remember that—"in lieu of any other reparations payments." We lost once—neither we, nor our allies, want that to happen again. Germany has agreed to this plan. In 1952, she signed the Bonn Convention agreeing that this property should be retained by the allies as their only reparations—and agreeing that she would compensate her own nationals for their losses due to property seizures by the allied powers.

Now this made sense. It would appear that we had refused to make the same mistake of World War I all over again.

Remember what I said about Germany's earlier default?

But listen to this. On March 7, 1954, Chancellor Adenauer appealed to the United States to return the vested German property.

So—just 2 years after another solemn agreement—the Bonn Agreement of 1952—we have the first move to cancel it.

So here we go again—down the same old disastrous and costly road. This German appeal is based on the historic policy of the sanctity of private property. Can't we see that we are talking about reparations—and not private property?

Can't we remember that obtaining reparations after fighting a victorious war is also a historic policy?

Can't we see—are we so blind not to see that the pressure to enact this legislation for return of the properties is coming from a few selfish people—the old notorious cartels that backed the Nazi machine in its attempt at world conquest? How blind and stupid and softhearted and fickle do they think we are?

This leads to my next point.

Under point 3, let's look at the cartel angle involved here. The name, "I. G. Farben" is notorious the world over.

Here is the world's greatest chemical trust—the one that gave to the murderous Hitler the technical know-how he needed. The one whose branches, spread throughout the world, constituted the greatest network for economic espionage ever seen. The one that was able to keep from us the secrets of synthetic rubber, among other things, when we needed that knowledge for our war effort.



And the same one—I. G. Farben—that ordered destroyed—and the orders were carried out—a nitrocellulose plant located at Afton Lake, N. Y. Nitrocellulose is the basis of high explosives, and the plant was destroyed—on orders from Germany—at the time Hitler started his invasion of Europe. It took us 2 years to replace that destroyed potential of war production.

These are the type of people a return of the property would aid—these and their fronts—not the little man, the little German, for whom it may be possible to generate some sympathy, but the big business tycoons and the international financial brigands.

That brings me to the next point—the windfall, bonus, or gift—call it what you will—that would be involved in a return of the property, and this is the most compelling argument of all against the proposed return.

When these properties were seized, they were much smaller than they are today, both in size and in value.

Their increased values all were brought about by American management backed by American labor and American know-how.

Let's look at just a few of them—Increase in value since 1942: General Aniline and Film Corp., from \$35 million to \$106 million. Schering Corp., from \$1,300,000 to its sales price of \$30 million. Spur Distributing Co., from \$1 million to \$3,300,000. Karl Liebknecht, from \$365,000 to \$6,500,000.

These are just a few. The increased value of all the properties—this windfall, bonus, or what have you—is close to \$200 million. Of all the giveaways this is the most flagrant and unjustified. You may wish to be a party to such an outrage, Mr. Chairman, but I hope you will excuse me.

Let us go to the next point.

It is the plan of the United States and its allies, solemnized by international agreements and treaties to not only keep this enemy property, but to try and make sure that it would never again fall into enemy hands.

In World War I, the then Custodian, after he had sold the German Bosch properties to citizens of our country, proudly announced that never again would this company fall into alien hands. Within a very few years, however, Robert Bosch, of Germany, had regained ownership of the corporation. The American purchasers had resold the firm to its original owners.

Came World War II, and Bosch property was again vested in our Alien Property Custodian. It was sold again in 1948, but this time in order to forestall a return to alien ownership, the certificate of incorporation was amended so as to restrict the ownership of the stock to American nationals.

The same thing was done when Schering Corp. was sold. This technique was applied in other sales.

Our Government believed that these companies should move into the American economy, and stay there.

That is one of the basic purposes of my bill, H. R. 80, to sell these companies into our economy. And they should be kept there.

All this leads me to my last point. One that involves the security of our Nation, and should be of paramount importance in your consideration.

Let us use but one example—General Aniline & Film Corp.

This is the major holding of our Alien Property Custodian, the largest single reparation we have, and the greatest I. G. Farben property taken from our former enemies by any allied custodian. This company has two of its principal plants in my district, as I have said, and consequently I am greatly interested in it, as well as the entire alien property problem.

This company has many secret processes that today are part of our defense effort. Some of them are so secret that it would be

dangerous to even apply for a patent, and thereby risk exposure. It is working closely with our Government and the Department of Defense.

This property was vested from a Swiss corporation, now loud in its protestations of neutrality and innocence. The Department of Justice says that this Swiss claimant was and is a cloak for I. G. Farben of Germany.

The reluctance of the Swiss to come to issue and trial of this question, and they brought suit in 1947 for return of the property, would indicate there is more here than meets the eye.

Now we know the Germans are expert at cloaking or hiding their external assets. We learned that in two world wars. They want this company with its treasure trove of dollars and know-how—American-developed know-how and American dollar earnings.

Representatives of the Swiss cloak deny this, and have even testified they want to "Americanize" the company, that they will sell it to Americans, but only after it is first returned to them.

Now if this were true, all they would have to do is to stipulate with the Department of Justice so as to allow our Government to make the sale. The lawsuit would then continue for the money resulting from such a sale. This is just what my bill would allow.

The Department of Justice conducts these sales in public to the highest qualified bidder. It has done so for years, and the sales have been successful. In this way, the retention of this great corporation by American owners could be made certain.

But no—the Swiss cloak won't agree to this. They want General Aniline back in their hands and what they will do with it no one can be sure.

They, by this stand, obviously want more than money.

Mr. Chairman, this problem has beset the Congress for many years since World War II. It is saturated with cross currents of conflicting interests, pressures, influences, and lobbyists. It is time to have it settled with finality. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have endorsed the provisions of H. R. 80—it has no partisan conflict. I urge that you make possible prompt action by the Congress at this session by reporting favorably H. R. 80, or some bill of similar nature and purpose. Thank you for your attention and consideration of these views.

### Sell Enemy Assets

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement filed by my colleague, Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, April 30, 1956, in support of his bill, H. R. 3608, and similar bills which would allow the Attorney General to sell vested enemy assets seized during World War II:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I, too, am very glad to have this opportunity to appear here today and say a few words in behalf of my bill, H. R. 3608, which is identical to that I introduced in the 83d Congress (H. R. 5896) and pertaining to the same subject, the Trading With the Enemy Act.

This resolution is also identical with that of my distinguished colleague, also from New York, Congressman COLE.

Like him, I have the sincere hope that this legislation will be acted upon by this committee.

I believe that our Government should be relieved of the very heavy burden, and duty, of operating the industries seized as reparations from our former enemies, Germany and Japan, during World War II.

If there is litigation involved, then let this matter be settled by our courts. I trust and believe in, and I am sure you do, too, our system of jurisprudence.

My colleague, Congressman COLE, has in detail explained the ramifications of the vested property subject. He has described the errors we made following World War I.

I say, let's not do that again.

In brief, I most sincerely subscribe to the remarks of Representative COLE for the good of this country.

I am more than generally acquainted with the subject before this committee. As you know, the most important and largest vested property—or single seizure involved here—is the General Aniline & Film Corp. One of its very main manufacturing operations, or plants—the oldest dye manufacturing plant in this country—is located in my district—the Albany, N. Y., area.

Our Government retains it as an I. G. Farben cartel holding—a former enemy possession located in the United States.

A Swiss corporation, known as I. G. Chemie but more generally referred to as Interhandel, has sued this Government for its return. This they have the right to do.

But as I understand it, they are close to losing this lawsuit in the American courts—after an 8-year fight. The suit was dismissed, and with prejudice, by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia unanimously. This was for failure to produce required documents on the court's order. However, and in spite of 8 years of litigation, the court gave the Swiss corporation another 6 months' grace in which to produce these documents to prove ownership. An appeal was made to the United States Supreme Court, which refused—unanimously—to hear the case. May I say here that time continues to drag on, and that the same documents, awaited for more than 8 years now, are still awaited.

Now, here is an interesting point which I would like to bring to the attention of this committee. The Swiss firm, I. G. Chemie or Interhandel, lays claim that under the laws of its country, Switzerland, it cannot obtain release of the necessary documents to conclusively establish ownership. Yet, on the other hand, they are the plaintiff seeking the protection of our courts.

Our Department of Justice will tell you, if you ask, that when its lawyers visited Switzerland under court order to inspect the documents claimed to be held by I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, that the Swiss Government immediately seized these documents and has kept them under lock and key ever since.

Such an order was also given to the attorneys for I. G. Chemie or Interhandel here in the United States, and our Department of Justice opened its files to them.

I think this an important point for the consideration of this committee and one to bear in mind.

I also think that this incident tends to set the scene for what has been going on now for some time on this subject—the pressure for return for these properties—and as exemplified by Chancellor Adenauer's request for return of the properties just 2 years after he signed an agreement that the United States shall retain these vestings as our only reparations of World War II.

On another interesting point, the Swiss newspapers—comparable to our own daily

financial publications, have reported expenditures by I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, of over \$400,000 in 1954 and around \$350,000 in 1955 for the lawsuit and attorney fees in the United States.

This, of course, is the action to gain return of the General Aniline & Film Corp. This is a little over \$750,000 in only 2 years. This, mind you, is for only 2 years and the claimant, I. G. Chemie, or Interhandel, filed its suit against this Government around 8 years or so ago. I wonder how much their total bill is now, overall, in this particular case?

I cite these figures without any insinuations of wrongdoing in any way. They are large enough, however, to be given consideration by this committee.

I might add that the articles, appearing in the Swiss financial newspapers, were connected with complaints by stockholders of Interhandel. And complaints which inquired as to where these funds were spent. The articles I have read merely gave totals without a breakdown of expenditures.

May I leave these thoughts with you as I think they should be given consideration.

In conclusion, I believe that this problem should be disposed of as quickly as possible—for economical reasons to this Government, and I sincerely believe there is every fairness in my bill and/or that of Congressman COLE's which will expedite this matter and still leave the door open to a legitimate and qualified claimant who is not a former enemy.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing here today. I hope that you will consider my remarks as part of the record of this hearing.

### We've Got To Attract and Keep the Men To Man Our Planes

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. PAUL B. DAGUE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 8, 1956*

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when Gen. Horace Wade spoke in behalf of his Strategic Air Command and emphasized the fact that we are spending "billions for equipment and peanuts for people," he put his finger on the glaring defect in the treatment we accord those who want to elect the armed services as a career but who, out of deference to the needs of their families and consideration for their own future, are forced to seek more lucrative employment in industry and the professions.

General Wade, in his appearance before the Senate subcommittee, was supporting his chief, General LeMay, and the substance of their joint recommendation was to the effect that an adequate program of incentives designed to encourage enlistments could actually save money while making possible a truly professional Air Force.

The average serviceman occupies in the minds of too many of us the role of "hero in war, zero in peace"; and while nothing is too great for the soldier or airman who mans our defenses when we are under attack, our treatment of him in peacetime is both illogical and senseless. We spend millions on a modern plane and then expect the man who pilots it to work for less than an ordinary mechanic's wages, even though he

has to be a technician of the highest type. But the thing we sacrifice so readily that is above price is the esprit de corps without which no military service ever amounted to a hill of beans. I say, with all of the emphasis I can command, that the time is here when we must make military service so attractive economically that we will have no difficulty in recruiting and keeping on the job the cream of American manhood to protect us from those who would destroy us.

### Disabled American Veterans Endorse Extension of GI Home Loan Guaranty Program and Principle of H. R. 10469

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DANTE B. FASCELL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 8, 1956*

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, extension of the GI home loan guaranty program must become reality in this session of Congress. It is now due to expire July 25, 1957.

This portion of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 has not burdened the American taxpayer. It instead has been to a large degree self-supporting. It has enabled the World War II veteran to become an integral part of his community through becoming a homeowner. Owning our own home was a privilege that only a limited few Americans could take advantage of prior to the enactment of this act. Through the act's home-loan guaranty provisions millions of veterans—yes, millions—now can say that they, too, own a small part of these great United States.

I ask you, What better could we do than to offer and allow our veterans an opportunity to own their own plot of land and their own home?

Is it too much to ask that we give them nothing other than an opportunity to purchase a home by merely guaranteeing their loan? I am sure that there are none who would or could objectively object to the granting of this consideration to our veterans.

Some 11 million veterans have not yet used their entitlement. Others have used only a part and still have a portion of their benefit remaining. Many of these World War II veterans are just now reaching the age and stage of financial responsibility where they can profitably afford to become homeowners.

Should we now take away their opportunity to purchase a home under the terms of this act merely because they have not yet reached this state? I think not.

Instead, I believe we should extend this proven program now, in this session of Congress. Let us allow ample time for these other millions of veterans to adequately prepare themselves so that they, too, can join in owning their own small part of America.

A bill I introduced April 12, 1956, will accomplish this. It provides for a grad-

ual termination of the program over a maximum period of 3 years from the present expiration date July 25, 1957, by allowing a 1-month extension for each 2 months of active World War II service. It goes one step further and provides all disabled World War II veterans with an extension of 3 full years.

Maj. Omer W. Clark, of the Disabled American Veterans, has written me a letter wherein he states that his organization would endorse any reasonable extension of the GI home loan guaranty program and that H. R. 10469 definitely falls in this category. The letter follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,

Washington, D. C.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: The provisions of H. R. 10469, the bill which you introduced to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans have been considered together with the information contained in the reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning your reasons for believing that this is desirable legislation. There has also been noted H. R. 10884, a bill introduced by Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, on the same general subject but somewhat different in its time provisions.

It is my opinion that the Disabled American Veterans is definitely desirous of seeing that otherwise eligible veterans are enabled to obtain guaranteed loans after the present deadline of July 25, 1957, and to that end should be recorded as favoring any reasonable proposed legislation seeking to extend the time limit. The bill you have introduced is definitely in this category.

Sincerely yours,

OMER W. CLARK,  
Director of Legislation.

### Woodrow Wilson Centennial Year

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 8, 1956*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a proclamation of the President of the United States concerning the Woodrow Wilson centennial year:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL YEAR

Whereas Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States, gave to this Nation and to the world a concept of peace based on justice and freedom and supported by the brotherhood of man; and

Whereas this scholar, educator, and statesman led the United States successfully through the ordeal of a devastating war, which was fought to preserve those high principles which this Nation cherishes; and

Whereas Woodrow Wilson's outstanding character, his devotion to his country's service, his efforts to strengthen the Government and to promote the public welfare, his dependence upon divine guidance, and his unflinching confidence in our system of free government and the ultimate wisdom of the



American people, are a lasting inspiration to the Nation; and

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, and the Congress, by a joint resolution approved August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964), established the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission to develop plans for commemorating that event; and by a joint resolution approved April 27, 1956, has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies.

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson; and I urge interested individuals and organizations, both private and governmental, to participate in appropriate ceremonies during 1956 designed to honor and commemorate his life, his ideals, and his concern for the freedom of peoples throughout the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 27th day of April in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the United States of America the 180th.

[SEAL] DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,  
Secretary of State.

## Dangers for the United States in the Middle East Crisis

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the very able gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, before the American Council for Judaism, Inc.:

#### DANGERS FOR THE UNITED STATES IN THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

(By Representative OMAR BURLESON before the American Council for Judaism, Inc., 12th annual conference, Chicago, Ill., April 28, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, I am pleased, as I am highly honored, at the invitation you have extended me to be with you on this occasion.

It gives me satisfaction to be identified with such men in your organization as your president, Clarence L. Coleman, Jr.; the chairman of your board, Lessing J. Rosenwald; your executive vice president, Dr. Elmer Berger; and others.

As a citizen of this great country, I am encouraged by the work, the attitude, and the dedication to principle of the American Council for Judaism. As a United States legislator and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am, if anything, even more keenly aware of the fact that you perform a great work, a much-needed service. I think every man and woman of your group displays great courage in taking the position you do on so many questions of concern to all Americans. I know your task is not an easy one, but I am deeply impressed by the fact that you have willingly shouldered the

grave responsibility of attempting to inform not only Americans of the Jewish faith but all Americans that no international movement of a political nature represents all the people of Jewish faith; that the national identification of people of Jewish faith is with their country of citizenship; and that Americans of Jewish faith are by no means unified behind a proposition which, according to certain well-known propaganda media, suggests American Jews need and want a homeland other than these United States with its equality for all who are its citizens.

One could easily conclude that when 17 organizations, commonly referred to as Jewish groups, meet in Washington for a common purpose, they represent all the Jews of this country. In fact, it would appear that the motivation of such meetings is to give the impression they do represent everybody and that the political pressures they apply have virtually universal support.

Not long ago, I was walking through the corridors of the Capitol of the United States with your Dr. Berger. We encountered a fellow Congressman of mine. I performed introductions and explained that Dr. Berger was connected with, and devoting his time to, the American Council for Judaism. "Oh, yes," my colleague responded, "I have had a considerable amount of literature on the subject of Israel." He, of course, had no idea what organization it was that had sent him literature on the subject of Israel, but Dr. Berger and I were reasonably sure it was not the American Council for Judaism.

This, however, is how it is with a great many people with whom I come in contact. Pressure groups are certainly not new in Washington. But pressure from so many different sources concentrated in one spot, in the manner of the Zionists, amounts to a tremendously powerful force.

That is one of the reasons why it is encouraging and inspiring to me to know of a group of Americans who will take a stand against this force in the face of tremendous opposition and unpopularity. It is something in Washington to see a pressure group pressurized. That, it seems to me, is just what your organization had the courage to do when it contacted the Secretary of State to advise him that the 17 so-called Jewish organizations united to press for arms to Israel did not represent the views of all Americans of Jewish faith.

I wonder how many of you realize the total impact of the work you are doing. Of course, you know your purpose is to inform the public generally that you do not subscribe to the idea of Jewish nationalism. But I can testify that you do far more than this. By the stand you have taken, you give courage to those of us in political life who are sensitive to the enormous pressures which are put upon us virtually every day in the year.

The sad and bitter truth of the matter is that objectivity—a desire to keep an open mind on certain problems—runs the grave risk of being denounced as anti-Semitism. There is always the possibility of this devastating accusation being made when any of us in public office dare raise our voice against the methods of the Zionists of this country, or when we happen to disagree with any expression of the views of those who are dedicated to putting the power and influence of the United States at the disposal of, and for the furtherance of, the national aspirations of the Zionist State of Israel.

My subject this evening is Dangers for the United States in the Middle East Crisis. Certainly I do not represent myself as being an expert on this subject. There are those present who could better lay claim to such a qualification.

The claim I make for myself is objectivity. I can further assure you that I feel free of emotion in discussing these issues which are obviously loaded with emotionalism.

It seems obvious to me that before we can begin to understand the nature of the crisis which the United States faces in this most strategic area of the world, we must go back a little to the history of the problem which lies at the root of the trouble.

The Middle East, for a long time the world's forgotten child, has come alive—almost too much alive. The nationalism of the long-dormant Arab world is engaged in a bitter conflict with the nationalism of the State of Israel.

Arab nationalism and the consciousness of the necessity for social reform are mingled with a deep suspicion of the West which has a long history of colonialism in the area. Not unrelated to this suspicion and no little part of the antagonism to Israel is the historical fact that the Zionist experiment in Palestine—under the Balfour Declaration—entered the area as part of the colonial controls imposed at the end of World War I.

The Middle East, as you know, is of vitally strategic importance—oil and millions of people now stirring in a variety of emergent national revolutions make it so. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently told a congressional committee; and here I quote:

"The importance of the Middle East to the free world can hardly be overestimated militarily and economically. First, its huge oil reserves now supply most of the wants of Europe, and their loss would be disastrous. Second, its geographic location is astride the lines of communication between West and East; and, third, it is only in this area that the Soviets have no buffer states."

In the Middle East lie the largest oil resources in the world—75 percent of the known reserves available to the free world. From the strategic United States airbase at Dhahran in Saudi Arabia, which figured so prominently in recent headlines, the Baku oilfields and other important industrial centers in the Communist world are easy targets.

The peacetime economy of Western Europe and of our allies there is dependent upon oil. And suppose, despite all of our efforts to wage peace, we should fail and find ourselves involved in a war with the Soviet Union. The problem of tankerage for oil which would be needed by our allies would be greatly increased if Middle East supply centers are lost, even assuming without argument that the supplies could be produced from our own sources. Furthermore, should the Soviet Union obtain access to the oil concessions of the Middle East now controlled by our allies, such acquisition might eliminate from the inscrutable calculation of the Kremlin one possible deterrent to war. Such a deterrent may now exist in the form of insufficient petroleum supplies under the control of the Soviet Union.

This Middle East area is important not only in itself, but because of the intimate ties of the people to struggling Arab nationalists in north Africa, to the west, and to the newly created Asian nations to the east. What is of moment in Cairo soon reverberates from Marrakech, in Morocco, to Bandung, in Indonesia.

The significance of the whole bloc of nations was dramatically illustrated at Bandung only about a year ago. If any of us are concerned with the welfare of our country for the future—in our own lifetime or certainly that of our children—we must find the ways to help these vast numbers of people to understand their aspirations and assist in the realization of their legitimate hopes.

It solves none of these problems for us to know that the United States has perhaps inherited more than it has created, of these annoyances and suspicions. There is little room in statesmanship for such rationalizing. The task of statesmanship is to obtain the facts, to face them and to construct the road of peace upon them.

In 1917 a hard-pressed British Government issued the Balfour Declaration as a war measure in the struggle against the Central Powers. The Balfour Declaration was a grant to establish—not a political state—but a Jewish homeland in Palestine for religious-minded Jews and refugees. And this grant was conditional: for included in the 67 words of the ambiguous declaration was the safeguarding clause which specifically protected the rights of the existing Arab communities.

Also included in the declaration was a general prohibition against anything being done by the Zionists "which may prejudice . . . the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

As we look back on the cumulative results of the history of Palestine, from the days of the declaration until now, it seems accurate to say that while Zionism exploited to the full the affirmations relating to the ambiguous entity designated as a national home, no one did anything effective about implementing either of the qualifying conditions.

At that time the Arabs constituted approximately nine-tenths of Palestine's population with the Jewish population in the Holy Land less than 50,000 at the turn of the century. The British hastened to assure the Arabs, who were rebelling against their Ottoman overseers, that they had no intent to subjugate the Arabs to Zionist rule.

Here I think it is important, for an understanding of the present impasse, to understand that this question of immigration was always the principal bone of contention.

Zionists were more or less satisfied with the yardstick of economic absorptive capacity. With this as the motivation, they appealed to the Jews of the world to supply money to build a Zionist economy in Palestine which might support increasing numbers of Jewish immigrants. At the same time, they opposed as contrary to the Balfour Declaration and the later mandate, every effort to establish self-government in Palestine, while there was still an Arab majority in the country.

Clearly, therefore, what the Zionists wanted and what was the substance of their long-range strategy was always a state in Palestine which they would control. While they were a minority in the country they demanded the right of complete sovereignty in the all-important question of immigration which would eventually determine the political character of the country. For all practical purposes, they succeeded in exercising this right.

Furthermore, and this is important both as history and in terms of understanding the present conflict, although the Zionists of Palestine could not accomplish this purpose alone, they were able to do so by reason of the political mechanism they operated, first in Britain and later in the United States.

In this process, the rights of the Arab population of Palestine were slowly whittled away. And, if I may say so, the increasing dependence of the Zionists in Palestine upon Jews outside for both political and economic support certainly blurred the qualification of the Balfour Declaration, which was intended as a safeguard against the involvement of non-Palestinian Jews in the political destiny of the Palestinian-Zionist undertaking. I suspect that it was precisely this increasing involvement of American Jews in a Zionist quasi-government in Palestine which brought about the creation of the American Council for Judaism.

This long-range strategy of Zionism, of course, became apparent only with the passing of time. The years between 1919-20 and 1947 were characterized by a three-way conflict. This was among official Zionism, which never lost sight of the political strategy of

immigration, however much less official followers looked upon immigration as humanitarian; Arab nationalists who saw the ultimate outcome of such a policy; and the British Government, charged under the mandate with assisting the people of the country to reach an eventual condition of self-government.

Something like halfway through this three-way struggle, Hitler's rise to power confronted the world with as revolting and atavistic a chapter of savagery and brutality as any historic period has ever seen. And when the Hitler madness grew to the proportions of a threat to the whole civilized world, the specter of another global war confronted mankind. So another impasse was added to the long-festering Palestine problem. For in the very face of the need of refuge for as many of Europe's Jews as could be saved, there arose a complicating factor—the necessity for the West to have a friendly—or at least a nonantagonistic—hinterland of people in the Middle East.

British efforts to find a way out of this dilemma produced the campaigns of illegal Zionist immigration and subsequent violence for Palestine.

By the spring of 1947, the British had decided to give up the ghost and place the Palestine controversy before the United Nations. A special session of the General Assembly was convened, an investigating committee was sent to the troubled area, and 7 months later the international organization recommended the partition of Palestine. The bitter struggle for votes at Lake Success was featured by unparalleled pressures.

During the following spring, the United States reconsidered the partition plan. Reports of the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency warned that the Palestine turmoil resulting from the actions of the United Nations acutely endangered the security of the United States. A trusteeship for Palestine became the new policy. While the United Nations debate was in progress, on May 15, 1948, the Zionists succeeded in setting up an independent state in Palestine, in territory which had been occupied for over 1,300 years by Arabs and which had not been Jewish for 2,000 years. Since that day, the Middle East struggle between the Arab and the Israeli has continued unabated.

Partition would never have won had it not been for the human factor. With the end of World War II, the plight of the displaced persons was pitiable. It was simple for the outside world, for humanitarian-minded Christians and Jews alike, to embrace a solution which seemed to solve two pressing problems at the same time—that of the refugees and that of the form of government Palestine was to assume. This is why so many Americans espoused the Zionist cause and favored the establishment of Israel.

Sympathy for the plight of the displaced persons was an emotion which we shall certainly never have cause to regret. But the support we gave to the Zionist plan for solving this problem by creating a Zionist state in Palestine has cost us dearly. It seriously undermined for our country the priceless high prestige we had always enjoyed in the Middle East among the people there because, unlike the British, the French, and the Spanish, we had never been a colonizing power. Our educators and missionaries had given to these people an example of selfless devotion to their welfare; an example of democracy at its best.

Tragically, this inestimable heritage of good will built up over the years was transformed, in a few moments, relatively speaking, by our well-meaning but ill-advised attempt to make it up to the Jews of Europe through aid to the Zionists in the Middle East.

What we achieved instead, in the Middle East, was to antagonize and embitter some 40 million people—an important part of the vast numbers of underdeveloped peoples whose friendship and support are really the big stakes in the East-West struggle. For if we, together with our allies in Western Europe, cannot persuade these underdeveloped peoples of the sincerity and integrity of our way of life, we—and our Western European allies—will some day be surrounded by great, heavily populated, rich-in-natural-resources areas of the world filled with suspicion and antagonism.

And, as we have come to expect, this embitterment to which we contributed in the Arab world was not missed by the Kremlin.

Disillusioned with the United States and the West, the Arabs were ripe for Russian advances. The more partial we became to the Zionists and the Israelis, the more the Arabs found themselves turning to the Soviets.

We, as Americans, make a great mistake—or perhaps I should say we are in danger of compounding our past errors—if we look upon this Soviet advance as an occasion for us to choose between Israel or the Arab States. This would suggest we must abandon one or the other.

In my humble opinion, the only American way to look at the present situation is against the background of this historical development of the problem which I have recited here in an extremely abridged form. What has taken place is that, for the first time in about two decades, the Arab States think they have a great power on their side. We know this great power is only another—and more vicious—form of colonialism. But our knowledge of this fact is not enough to save the Arab world for us. We fear Soviet advances will not stop at simple, commercial deals as the Arabs believe they will. But our knowledge of this fact, too, is not enough to prevent the subversion of the area.

If, as even the President of the United States has said, the Middle East is of great strategic importance to us, our national responsibility calls for positive action and avoidance of further negative irritants. Only in this way do we stand a chance of seizing away from the Soviets what now appears to be the initiative they have captured in the area.

It should be obvious to even the most partisan supporters of Israel that if the entire Arab world should go Communist, one casualty of such a catastrophe would be Israel itself.

Paradoxically, had we been less partial to Israel in the past, Israel, as well as the rest of the free world, might today be much more secure.

I am appalled when I reflect upon the difficulty of the problems we must face if we are to avert the most tragic consequences in the Middle East. For this task we shall need every ounce of our insight, our finest diplomatic skill, and a kind of transcendental integrity. Above all, we shall need to present to the world a nation united behind a policy motivated by the most unselfish, the most humane, the most impartial of motives. Unless we can so present ourselves, especially to the protagonists in the conflict, our efforts are doomed from the start.

It is for this reason, I am sure, that the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, said what he did to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last February. You will recall that he repeated an earlier statement expressing the hope that the Arab-Israeli dispute be kept out of the presidential election campaign this year. The position of the Secretary of State is one with which I find myself in the most heartfelt agreement.

It seems to me that so long as the question of United States policy for the Middle East continues to be a political football on the



domestic scene we shall never arrive at any solution in the national interest. In this problem, as in all our problems of foreign policy, we must stick closely to the basic principle that differences among us cease at the water's edge. It is time for all candidates for public office in the United States—Republicans and Democrats alike—who have viewed this controversy as a convenient means of bartering for votes to realize that we have been callously playing politics with American national security.

When our first Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, tried to get the Nation's two political parties to agree not to press the Middle East issue, he was met by rebuff and scorn. Mr. Forrestal was told that the Democratic Party would be bound to lose the advantage in certain States. His answer, as revealed in his diaries, was "It is about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might not lose the United States." That retort of Mr. Forrestal's is more applicable today than ever.

Those of us who sincerely desire to demonstrate our friendship for the small State of Israel certainly will be yielding no ground if we ask that as the Middle East is debated, as it may be in election campaigns where our whole foreign policy is a legitimate subject for debate on a high level, the debate be on the issues of broad American interests in the whole area. It seems to me proper to ask any groups of Americans to assist in maintaining the debate on such a high level by avoiding the kind of partisan pressure tactics which led even so strong a friend of Zionism as Mr. Truman to complain. I think to suggest such standards for the debate is not to impugn the rights of any Americans. For our rights entail also responsibilities. And one responsibility of any American who petitions his Government is to be sure he is doing so as a free, sovereign, American citizen.

What I mean to say, above all, is that delicate negotiations which might lead to a just and equitable settlement of the complex problem in the Middle East can never be conducted against a background of bartering for a Jewish vote which I do not believe exists; the implied acceptance of which I believe to be a slander upon the integrity and the desire of Americans of Jewish faith to be part and parcel of the American people.

Among the many extremely useful things your organization has done, to my mind, have been your vigorous and repeated assertions that there is no such thing as a Jewish vote presumably committed uncritically to the advancement of the foreign State of Israel. It seems to me to be self-evident that Americans who happen to profess the religion of Judaism, do not behave any differently in the voting booth than do Americans who happen to be Baptists or those who happen to be Methodists, Catholics, or Latter Day Saints.

I hope your organization continues to make it clear, particularly in this most important election campaign in which we are all about to become engaged, that anyone who says American Jews vote as a bloc to favor Israel slanders Jews, complicates an already highly complex problem for the United States Government and actually does Israel more harm than good.

Prof. William Ernest Hocking, of Harvard, in a letter to the New York Herald Tribune on March 4 wrote; and here I quote:

"We are again at a time when presidential issues are in the air, and when, as our political life has been running, it is prudent for any candidate or potential candidate to 'speak comfortably to Jerusalem.' I raise the question: What would happen if some presidential possibility were to speak uncomfortably to the present-day Jerusalem, in the interests of the honor and independence of the American voter?"

"If it were suggested that votes might be lost, I ask, whose votes? They could be none but those prepared to put the interest of a foreign state prior to the interest of this country and of mankind. But can any candidate afford to lose them?"

"I am looking for the man who will state this disgraceful situation clearly to the American people and publicly renounce any such vote."

I make no pretense to being the man for whom Professor Hocking is looking. But here and now I am prepared to say, as soberly as I know how, that I am one of what I fervently hope will be an increasing number who may seek to qualify.

My interest in this particular aspect of United States foreign policy is not new. About 2 years ago while witnesses from the Department of State were testifying on the foreign-aid program before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, they were questioned about the millions of dollars from the United States, contributed by American citizens in the form of bond sales and through the United Jewish Appeal to the Israeli Government.

Mr. Arthur Z. Gardiner, then politico-economic advisor to the State Department's Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, said of these contributions, and I quote:

"Now these contributions, of course, are deductible for purposes of tax computation and they certainly have a bearing on our income-tax structure. How to evaluate or appraise that, I do not know."

A little later, Mr. Norman S. Paul, who was the State Department's Middle East regional director, made an extremely interesting statement. Here I quote him:

"The funds they have received through the United Jewish Appeal, just as the funds they received through these bond drives, have made up the pool from which they meet their defense as well as other requirements. . . . We can trace our funds definitely into projects and determine the commodities, but I don't think you could take the United Jewish Appeal contributions and do the same thing."

At this point, I said that if funds collected by the United Jewish Appeal were used for defense and for general economic development of Israel, they should definitely be taken into account in arriving at the question of what Israel needed from us. I said—and here I quote myself:

"When the dollars in the barrel are stirred you can't identify each, but nevertheless, those exempt contributions, as are the reparations payments, become available for any use. Why should this committee not take into consideration all these other contributions when we are considering grants-in-aid on that basis?"

I think of these questions our committee discussed 2 years ago when I notice that the increased armaments in the hands of Egypt are now being used as a sales-argument to raise a greatly increased quota this year for the United Jewish Appeal. I wonder about the logic, for the United States, in such a situation. One of the reasons Egypt turned to Czechoslovakia for arms was that the dollar cost of American arms to the Egyptians was too high. Egypt needed those arms to meet what, with concern for its own national security, it believed to be a rising threat from Israel following the Gaza attack of February 1955. Yet we in the United States help make it possible for Israel to purchase arms with dollars imported through the United Jewish Appeal but not segregated for strictly charitable purposes.

Soberly, earnestly, I ask those who direct and support such policies if they are of real, unqualified assistance to the United States at a time when our Nation's interests are gravely imperiled in the Middle East.

I am not making any accusations. I have little evidence of the extent—if any—to

which the American taxpayer is without his knowledge or consent underwriting either the military power of the State of Israel or the pressure politics of the Zionist movement in the United States. I would hope, for the sake of our country and for all our citizens, that it is possible for someone to secure a detailed, fully audited breakdown, to the last dollar, of the ultimate disposition of the vast sums of money collected every year in this country in the name of philanthropy and which, to the extent that they are deductible from income tax, are subsidized by the American taxpayer.

It may be that such an accounting is available. If it is, I have not seen it. I raise the question only to point out that publication of such an accounting is perhaps long overdue. I raise it in the fervent wish that my suspicions may be proved to be unfounded. I raise it in all sincerity, hoping at the same time that I may be forced to apologize for giving rise to fears which may have no foundation.

I raise the question now, as I did in 1954, because of its very grave bearing upon our chances for reaching a settlement of the crisis in the Middle East. One of the factors which adds enormously to the difficulties we face in this area is the conviction, shared by many of the Arab States, that the United States Government is hopelessly subservient to Zionist pressures. One of the strongest indications, to the Arabs, that this is the case, is the fact that apparently no official of the United States Government dares to raise this kind of question in connection with what happens to the vast sums of money raised in this country and made available to the Israeli Government.

Once this, and perhaps certain other questions are clarified, it seems to me that American public opinion should certainly be willing to support a compromise settlement for the Middle East—a settlement which would be in the interests of American security; a settlement which would do justice to the Arabs, and a settlement which would not drive the Israelis into the sea—a widely held fear.

Such a settlement must accord justice to both sides. There are 900,000 Arab refugees who have become the innocent victims of the creation of the State of Israel. Both sides must be induced to make concessions which will help settle this problem. If Israel will offer to repatriate Arab refugees, that is, to let them have their land back or else compensate them for their losses, much of the Arab grievance would be dissipated. Many of the Arabs will not wish to return, but will prefer compensation. This refugee problem lies at the heart of the conflict.

Let us remember that just concessions at this time can avoid disaster. The alternative is that either the Israelis attack and conquer the Arabs or the Arabs attack and conquer them. In neither case is it likely that Israel can win. Should they initially conquer the Arabs, the task confronting 1,700,000 people of keeping under subjugation 40 million Arabs will prove an impossible one. Moslems of the surrounding countries will inevitably become involved. The floodgates to communism will be opened by the Arabs as they struggle to free themselves from any temporary rule under the Israelis. Can the West afford to permit this to happen? On the other hand, it becomes very difficult to see what the West can do if the Arabs become strong enough to attempt to throw Israel into the sea and if there is built into such strength increasing bitterness and hostility. For it is a certainty that the United States, either together with the West or alone, cannot engage the whole Moslem world in conflict in Israel's behalf. Nor can the United States alone, or with its allies, long avoid a decision to help the Moslem world in its emergent renaissance from North Africa to Indonesia.

In the vast expanse of territory and peoples, Israel must be seen in its proper perspective; and, in the long pull of history, if Israel is to endure it will be a service to it if American Jews do not encourage it, either directly or through pressure on their own Government, to hold an exaggerated opinion of its place in the context of world politics.

Unless one believes in some kind of pan-Israelism, or in some new version of the "white man's burden" in the form of an Israel destined to dominate the Middle East, I think nothing I have said can be construed as anti-Israel. Moreover, because I think I know something of the history of the problem, I am sympathetic to the reason why the Israelis hold an exaggerated opinion of their role in history. For too long the West—unmindful of consequences—yielded to almost every whim of Israel's Zionist progenitors.

But there comes a time, and nearly a decade in the life of a nation may not be too soon, when a sovereign nation demonstrates its maturity by seeing itself in its true proportions and in the perspective of the world's insistent desire for peace. One certain contribution Israel could make today to the peace of the world is to renounce its Zionist internationalism; to bestow neither favors upon, nor require obligations of, people who are not its citizens; to turn its national face and energies, which are great, to the Middle East; to act the mature part which it claims for itself in its own comparisons of its sovereignty with the Arab world and, with a generosity commensurate with the favoritism it has enjoyed in the past, actively seek a peace with its Middle East neighbors. This, more than its propaganda, would demonstrate its dedication to western hopes for peace. In this way Israel might repay some of its debt to the West and, not the least, to Jewish citizens of the western nations, who for a complexity of reasons have showered on Israel and its Zionist antecedents innumerable blessings.

The role of impartiality for which the Department of State has pleaded is motivated by a desire to keep the Communists out of the area. In any arms race between the United States and Russia, the 40 million Arabs can more quickly absorb Russian weapons, incremented by the large obsolete quantities possessed by the Kremlin, than can the West supply Israel with arms. Israel's future then lies in making such concessions as will buy them what they most need to survive, namely, peace.

Will this problem ever be finally and completely solved? As Americans, we are accustomed to attacking problems head-on and fighting our way through to a complete and total solution. In my native State of Texas, for instance, the problems with which we deal seem to fall pretty largely in the area of combating the ravages of nature. We have to contend with drought, with excessive rains, with tornadoes, and floods. In all these cases, catastrophic though they may be, there is at least the satisfaction of knowing on which side we are.

In the political field, however, and most typically, it seems to me, in connection with the problems we have to face in the Middle East, we are dealing with issues which are not nearly as clear-cut and where, instead of there being a black-and-white contrast between good and evil, we have a situation in which there are shades of gray over virtually everything.

I have the feeling that the situation in the Middle East is in many ways comparable to that which prevailed there during the Middle Ages and earlier when the conflict, instead of taking place between Arab and Zionist nationalism was between two different groups, each of which referred to the other as infidels. Moslems and Christians for many generations in that area engaged in bloody battles with each other until somehow, with neither side ever being completely victorious, a kind of *modus vivendi* came to

exist between them. The Christians and the Moslems never really made a formal peace with each other. I am sure that they still think of each other (privately) as infidels. Nevertheless, with the passing of time, they did learn to live with each other. The conflict between them, although never really resolved, did manage, by the very fact that it continued for so long, to ameliorate itself.

I am an optimist about the Middle East. However, I am not so much of an optimist as to believe that we are going to find a just, a permanent, and a peaceful solution which will satisfy everyone within the very near future.

Perhaps, in the present situation, we should lower our sights a bit. I believe if we accept the probability that the best we can hope to achieve for some time is a gradual amelioration of the intense emotionalism and bitterness which have characterized both sides to this controversy, we shall have come a long way.

In the long run, at any rate, it may be that this realistic view will help prevent the situation in the Middle East from deteriorating to the one irrevocable disaster of all-out war. Such a war could benefit no one except the power-hungry masters of the Soviet Union.

Perhaps our immediate objective, therefore, should simply be, not a final peace, but the continued absence of war. If both parties to the controversy continue to live as neighbors, if not at peace then at least not actually engaged in physical combat, the very passing of time itself may tend to dull the edge of the hatred which now divides them.

With the passing of time and the lessening of the hatred—and everything which we, as Americans of good will, can do to encourage the lessening of that hatred—the day of a final, lasting, and peaceful solution may not be as far off as it sometimes may seem.

I wish for the American Council for Judaism continued success in offsetting spurious claims to real authority over American Jews advanced by individuals or groups pre-committed to linking American power and prestige in the area only to Israel.

benefits for American export trade from foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about our colleague's mail, but I am thoroughly familiar with mine. On March 6, 1956, I received a letter from the United Mine Workers of America reiterating their opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and their vigorous opposition to the passage of H. R. 5550. Included with that letter was an attachment which further explained their opposition to this bill. As part of my remarks, I include both communications:

MARCH 5, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For many years the United Mine Workers of America has opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. We have opposed it because there is nothing reciprocal about it. It is used by the State Department without regard for the best interests of American business and labor, which must meet low-wage foreign competition.

H. R. 5550, a bill now in the Ways and Means Committee, sets up a rulemaking body which would legalize the rules and laws which up to now have been made illegally by the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Each year the opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act grows stronger. We are confident the day will come when the plight of American industry will force Congress to rewrite this legislation. As long as the Congress maintains full power to regulate commerce and to levy and collect duties on imports, we must accept its decisions. But we bitterly oppose the usurpation of these powers by GATT and the legal recognition of its stepchild, the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

We respectfully ask each Member of Congress from the coal-mining States to oppose the passage of H. R. 5550.

Sincerely yours,  
ROBERT E. HOWE,  
Director, Labor's Non-Partisan League.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION,  
H. R. 5550

The OTC, or Organization for Trade Cooperation, would be a specialized agency of the United Nations dedicated to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT. This is the new international trade organization that Congress is now being asked to approve. The bill is H. R. 5550 and is now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The new OTC represents an effort to unload GATT on the United States in a form that will make it permanent.

The so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement, of which OTC is a part, is now 21 years old. The United Mine Workers of America has opposed the Reciprocal Trade Act since its inception.

OTC has been advertised as calling for no supranational power, yet that is exactly what it would have in practice and in fact—and that is also exactly what the State Department wants it to have. Otherwise the Department would not be interested in it. Since the OTC would have an assembly, which means a law or rule-making body, passage of H. R. 5550 would make legal the rules and laws which up to now have been made illegally by the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Our Constitution conferred upon Congress in unmistakable black and white the power to regulate foreign commerce and to lay and collect duties on imports. Congress has legislated repeatedly since 1951, when the escape-clause amendment to the Trade

### United Mine Workers of America Express Opposition to the Passage of H. R. 5550

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1956, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], placed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "The Coal Industry and H. R. 5550." Among other things, this article included the following paragraph, and I quote:

Although representatives of the coal industry were opposed last year to the enactment of H. R. 1, the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, no spokesman either from the management or labor side of the coal industry came before the Ways and Means Committee to oppose enactment of this bill. This shows that even though the representatives of the coal industry were opposed to further reduction of tariffs, that they recognized that H. R. 5550 will not lower tariffs by one iota, but would on the contrary, help to get the greatest



Agreements Extension Act of that year was adopted. Congress has made its will known repeatedly in legislation, in many amendments to that escape clause, to make sure that all American producers faced with hurtful import competition have a reasonable remedy.

This legislation has been rendered impotent by the stubborn opposition of the State Department—a Department that seems to find it hard to believe that American producers are entitled to the most elementary considerations of fair treatment.

For years the United Mine Workers of America has advocated and supported legislation to provide quota limitations on foreign imports. Now we are told that Congress cannot legislate quotas or provide the mechanism for their imposition by an administrative agency without violating the letter and spirit of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

By just what pattern of reasoning the State Department could arrive at the notion that they could properly bind Congress against any particular type of legislation on quotas, or anything else, has not yet been explained. These powers have been, in effect, usurped by GATT and because of ignorance and indifference on the part of the Congress, they have succeeded in getting away with murder. Now they are attempting to make the past actions of GATT legitimate by having Congress pass H. R. 5550 which sets up the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

By defeating H. R. 5550 Congress would recapture its constitutional authority and responsibility and once more labor and business, the producers of this country, would regain their lost voices in the determination and direction of trade policies that are of the greatest importance.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the above letter and attachment were mailed to every Representative from districts where coal is mined and that a copy of same was read into the record of the hearings on H. R. 5550 by Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY.

I am also informed that coal-industry representatives support the same position as taken by the United Mine Workers of America.

**Edward V. Gronet, Polish-American Leader**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Polish-American professional and businessmen of the metropolitan area—Greenpoint, Brooklyn—honored Edward V. Gronet with a testimonial dinner-banquet, Sunday, April 15, 1956, in Brooklyn, N. Y. The event marked the 10th anniversary of Eddie Gronet as a polka disc jockey of Polish-American radio program Polka Time from station WWRL, Woodside, N. Y. He was the first to introduce a Polish-American TV program, WATV Polka Party, on channel 13, Newark, N. J., which covers four States: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

The entire program for the testimonial dinner-banquet was prepared and arranged by the following Polish-American professional and business men: Chairman, Vincent Brunhard, president of the Ampol Baking Co.; vice chairman, Matthew Widlicki, vice president and treasurer of the D. & Z. Bottling Co.; Martin Weglicki, president of the White Eagle Market; treasurer, John Bucko, of the Bucko Jewelers; secretary, Ted Maksymowicz, of radio station WEVD; journal committee, Paul Pucilowski, of the Powers Furniture Co.; financial secretary, Mrs. Kashimira Garrison, of the Garrison Beauty Salon; ticket committee, Edward Zielienieski, of Martin's Shoe Store; and the reception committee, Al Bartosiewicz, of Newell Fuel Co., Hal Korman, and Dick Martin, WWRL-WATV.

As known to many friends and in the professional field, Eddie Gronet is a man of many accomplishments. In addition to his radio and TV programs, Eddie has one of the outstanding dance and recording orchestras in this area. The voice of Eddie Gronet is known to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans of Polish and non-Polish descent through his radio, TV programs, orchestra, and records.

Eddie Gronet received his education at the Sts. Cyril and Methodius Roman Catholic Parochial School, Bishop Loughlin Memorial High School, and Manhattan College—majoring in music and accounting.

During World War II he served in the United States Armed Forces with distinction for 4 years. Upon completion of his basic training, he was assigned to a tank destroyer unit and later transferred to the finance department at Camp Hood, Tex., where he was promoted to private first-class. Two months later he was promoted to staff sergeant and headed the enlisted personnel and officers day section. Third promotion in succession within 1 year raised him to the rank of warrant officer, junior grade, in the 8th Army Corps, Dallas, Tex. Later he was assigned to the 66th Infantry Division as an administration officer and was shipped overseas in 1944, where he served in England, Germany, France, and with the occupied forces in Vienna, Austria. While in Vienna, Gronet served in the Four Power Secretariat Office as chief clerk under Gen. Mark Clark. He was honorably discharged in May 1946 as chief warrant officer.

After returning from his tour of duty, Gronet resumed his radio and musical career. For the past 10 years he conducted, produced, and is the director of Polish programs at radio station WWRL, Woodside, Long Island, N. Y., and as such participated in many community drives for American Red Cross, heart fund, TB health fund, March of Dimes, Greenpoint Central Polish National Alliance of Brooklyn camp fund, and numerous Catholic and social charities.

Eddie Gronet has one of the outstanding dance and dance-recording orchestras in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, often appearing at Roseland Ballroom on Broadway. He is a recording artist, having performed for

Columbia Records and currently under contract with Coral Records. He is also an instructor at the Harmony Music School.

In 1950 he was awarded a plaque for being chosen the favorite polka band in a contest sponsored by Melody Girls, affiliated with the Polish Singers Alliance of America, and in 1953 was awarded a plaque by St. Adalbert Alumni Association, of Bronx, N. Y., as the most popular polka disc jockey. He was also a winner of first prize in a band contest sponsored by Loew's Meserole Theater in 1944. Last September 1955 Eddie Gronet's WATV Polka Party was awarded the first prize blue ribbon by the New Jersey State County Fair held in Trenton, N. J., for the outstanding TV program of its type.

Besides his music and radio work, Gronet is very active in numerous church, social, fraternal, and community organizations. He served a brief term as president of the Polish-American Democratic Club of the 15th Assembly District in Brooklyn, during which term he was a candidate for the assembly; vice commander of George Washington Post, No. 3, Polish Legion of American Veterans—PLAV; secretary of the White Eagle Democratic Club; a director of downstate New York division, Polish American Congress, member of Musicians' Union, Local 802, A. F. of M.; member of the American Radio and Television Artists—AFTRA; Greenpoint Lions Club; Victory Club; Kosciusko Foundation; General Pulaski Memorial Committee trustee; Polish National Alliance; Sons of Poland; Holy Name Society; and Knights of Columbus.

Eddie Gronet is a true, a sincere, and a devout Polish and an American patriot, always willing to devote his time, energy, and services toward freedom and democracy. He serves and represents the Polish people of his and other communities well in all respects, and the Polish people are always very proud of him. Eddie, through his untiring efforts, continues to promote Polish culture in all fields among Americans. Eddie Gronet is considered one of the outstanding Polish-American leaders in the New York metropolitan area.

**Keep Your Guard Up**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 5, 1956, in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., a million-dollar National Guard armory was dedicated.

It was my honor and privilege, not only as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, but also as a former National Guard man for many years, to be selected to deliver the address of dedication.

That address follows:

I am happy to be home—home in a city whose citizens, not looking with outstretched hands to Uncle Sam, voted to spend their own money in building such a splendid armory, the most practical, usable armory I have ever seen. Quite frankly, and honestly, it is a much better, more practical and beautiful armory than you would have had if Uncle Sam had been mixed up in its construction, telling you how to build it, and what you could or could not incorporate in it.

I am happy to be here, in my official capacity as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations which provides the funds, not only for our regular military services, but also for the United States National Guard. I am proud of my nearly 20 years of service in the National Guard, both as a member of the 35th Division in World War I and later years after I made Kansas City, Kans., my home.

I am not here as a recruiting officer for the National Guard, but if I were here in that capacity, I would point out that despite the cynical smiles and sweet talk we now receive from Red Khrushchev and his Kremlin crew we must face the hard, inescapable fact that as long as Soviet Russia remains a menace to the peace and security of the world—including the United States of America—we must maintain a strong national defense, of which the National Guard is such an important part.

For this reason young Americans face an obligation of military service for the next 10, 20, 30, perhaps 50, years.

I would point out that in the local units of the National Guard young Americans can serve with men of their acquaintance and from their community—serve, and continue their studies—serve and work on their jobs—serve and live with their families and friends.

National Guard service, in peace or in war, is an honorable service, in which any American can take great pride. It is an important part of our national defense. That importance is recognized by the Regular Army—as proven by the message of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Army Chief of Staff, and the presence of his Vice Chief of Staff, General Palmer.

Audie Murphy, of whom you have heard or read, is recognized as the outstanding hero—the most decorated American soldier in World War II. Audie Murphy, holder of the Congressional Medal, is again serving his country—not in the Regular Army—but in the United States National Guard. If National Guard service was not an honorable and important service, service in which any soldier can take pride, do you think for a minute that Audie Murphy—hero, soldier that he is—would be in its service? The question answers itself.

I am happy, too, to be here on this occasion, upon which we dedicate this building, for another reason. It is more than a building—it is a dream come true—a tangible testimonial to the vision, tenacity, and faith of one man, Col. Mahlon S. Weed.

Years ago, as a 1st lieutenant, Company G, 137th Infantry, I listened long hours to the "Skipper" for he was then Captain Weed—draw his word picture of what we needed to properly train troops.

At that time, the National Guard armory—called that for lack of a better name—was the old theater, now the site of a laundry, at 15th and Central, just around the corner from here.

Offices and supply rooms were in small, insecure storerooms, with no heat in winter and no ventilation in summer. A side street was our drill field.

Later on the armory site was the basement of Memorial Hall—where units during drill had to dodge countless 36-inch square pillars; where classrooms were inadequate;

where all other activity had to stop if any practice firing was to be done.

Even so, the National Guard units that trained there were well-trained and the men who were trained in those units went into World War II and made outstanding records, earning high awards and battlefield commissions—all trained under the leadership of officers like Captain Weed, Capt. Leo Swoboda, Capt. Harry Lyon, Captain Adams, Lieutenant Starry, Major Gloyne, and ever so many others, citizens of this community who saw and shared Skipper Weed's vision.

World War II found our National Guard units ready to answer the call to service from that inadequate memorial basement armory—these units were under the station commander, the late Lt. Col. C. P. Barshfield.

Company G, 137th Infantry, Capt. Mahlon S. Weed, commanding.

Second Battalion Headquarters Company, 137th Infantry, 1st Lt. Don A. Starry.

Medical Detachment, 161st Field Artillery, Maj. Louis Gloyne.

Band, 127th Field Artillery, W. O. Charles M. Nixon.

Thirty-fifth Signal Company, Capt. Clyde B. Adams, and 2d Battalion Headquarters Batteries of 127th Field Artillery, formerly 114th Cavalry, commanded by Capt. Leo Swoboda and Capt. Harry Lyon.

After World War II was ended, most of these men came home. Some had died in combat. National Guard activities were renewed in the basement of the Memorial Building, old units were revived, new units were organized. Today, in Kansas City, Kans., we have 8 units: Company F, 137th Infantry; Company G, 137th Infantry; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 137th Infantry; 2d Battalion Platoon Medical Company, 137th Infantry; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 197th Transportation Battalion; 137th Transportation Truck Company; 42d Army Band; and 772d Engineer Company.

In addition, facilities are provided for the administrative headquarters, 137th Infantry, and the three Regular Army advisers stationed here to supervise and assist with training.

These new units, with the advance of military science, demonstrated the need for new facilities. Many plans were developed and discarded.

Finally, with the bond election almost unanimous, the way was clear. Today you see the culmination of all those efforts. On this ground stands, by your efforts, this magnificent armory, in which the youth of today and tomorrow will receive training from experienced, dedicated men, noncommissioned, as well as commissioned, officers, training that some day may not only save their own lives, but may very well save your country and your life.

The history of the National Guard of the United States is part of the history of this Nation. Militia, it was called in the early days, but militiamen have made history in every war from the minutemen of Concord and Lexington, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the Mexican Border War, on through St. Mihiel, and the Argonne of World War I, to the steamy, slimy islands of the Pacific and the battlefields of North Africa, Italy, France, Belgium, and Germany in World War II—men who made history in the grey dawn of Omaha Beach, at St. Lo—right up to the very gates of Berlin—after bitter battling at Bastogne through that cold, cold Christmas of 1944.

In World War I over one-fourth of the troops in Europe were national guardsmen (including the 35th Division). World War II saw 9 National Guard units fight in Europe, and 9 in the Pacific. All turned in magnificent records, just as they did later in Korea.

And speaking of Korea, there are many interesting facts not generally recognized or appreciated by the general public. One of

them is that Korea was not a so-called brushfire war. It was a war of considerable magnitude as demonstrated by the fact that nearly 2 million more men served during the Korean conflict than in World War I, and we World War I veterans thought that was a big war.

The other fact is that, in that conflict in faroff Korea, again it was civilian soldiers that carried the greater part of the burden.

As may be expected, in view of the almost overnight suddenness with which Korea began, the first ground troops in action were those hastily assembled Regular Army forces then on duty in the Far East. As the war progressed the ratio of Regular to non-Regular decreased so that in December 1951, 2 out of every 3 enlisted soldiers were civilians: National Guards, reservists, and selectees.

In the ranks of officer personnel, Army—and this was generally true of the Air Force, and the naval aviation—from the very beginning 4 out of every 5 officers engaged in the Korean conflict were reservists—non-Regular Army officers.

What was true there and in other wars will always be true. This Nation is not a military nation. Military service is not overly welcomed as career. We have never maintained a large peacetime military force until now. When, in this period of uneasy peace, we have just under 3 million men in service, a Regular Army of over 1 million, nearly a 1-million-man Navy, and almost a million-man Air Force.

Even so, when the "chips are down," "when the bell rings" when another war comes upon us, the major portion of our military manpower will, as it has in the past, come from our civilian soldiers such as the men in these and other National Guard units—and the Reserve components.

Today, as we sit here, Air National Guard pilots in jet planes, such as those participating today, are on the end of runways—on active duty—ready to answer any scramble warnings, as an every-day integral part of our air defense command—minutemen in every sense of the word—on the alert 24 hours each day—in the service of their country for its security.

We used to hear the phrase "A million men spring to arms overnight." That never was true, and it is further from the truth today than ever before.

The science of war, while basic, is ever-changing. The bow gave way to gunpowder, used in the early day, ineffective, highly inaccurate matchlock weighing nearly 20 pounds. These gave way to our effective, accurate, light, hand weapons of today. The pike gave way to the bayonet, which, incidentally, was originated in Bayonne, France, where it got its name when it was but a short sword or pike point to be inserted in a gun muzzle to make that early day doughboy a pikeman as well as a musketeer. Horse cavalry grudgingly gave way to tanks. Hand semaphore has been replaced by radio. Runners save their lives and legs by walkie-talkies. Television today shows a commander what goes on up front. Trucks, jeeps, helicopters and one-man "flying platforms" take the place of "shank's mare." Recoilless weapons, rockets, and missiles of many types displace some of the old artillery. Electronic devices of amazing complexity are just short of miraculous.

We sing in our national anthem about "the rockets red glare; bombs bursting in air." From those rockets used in the War of 1812, the new honest John is a far, far cry; and when it comes to the puny pop and flare of those bombs—as compared to our A and H bombs—there really is a change. Antiaircraft artillery is being superseded by Nike and other guided missiles, which can seek, track, and strike enemy planes.

The old Jn—the early days Army "Jenny"—has been surpassed by jets, fighters and



bombers, and guided missiles—pilotless bombers—in effect.

Our new modern Army, of which the 27 divisions of the National Guard and 27 Air National Guard wings are such an important part, needs new modern training facilities. Here in this modern building, which you have given them, your citizen-soldiers will learn about these modern weapons, radio, radar, electronics, the new as well as the older weapons of war. The faith and confidence you have shown in them will be returned to you a thousand-fold in the years to come.

After all, these young men are your sons; they pay their taxes, and it amounts to one-half million dollars per year, is spent right here in their home community, which means that this is not only an investment in the future security of our Nation, but looking at it from a selfish angle, it is also a good business investment, because each one of those dollars turns over seven times before it leaves the community.

You have given a modest sum in your tax dollars, a premium on your insurance policy for national security. These young men who train here will give of their time—time taken from pleasurable pursuits, time taken from their families, time taken from vacations, perhaps they may even give their lives, all in order that you and the Nation may sleep better tonight and every night.

No one knows when they may again be called upon for peacetime duty, just as they were on black Friday, July 13, 1951, when the biggest flood of all times hit our homes.

No one knows when these units will be called into Federal service. Maybe tomorrow, perhaps never. Yet with the advent of atomic power, with Russia a menace to world peace, when it is possible, though not probable, that nearly any part of our Nation might become a target, the National Guard becomes more and more an integral part of our national defense system.

So it is with great pleasure that I share with you the joy you have in dedicating this building to the service of your community, your State, and your Nation, to be used in the training of your youth for service in time of war or peace. These young men serving in the units which will use this armory, I am sure, will in the future, just as their fathers did in the past, serve with skill, courage, and loyalty—serve in such an exemplary manner that they themselves, and you, will have great pride in their service and exploits should the call ever come.

With these marvelous modern facilities they will be far better prepared than they could have been otherwise. Even so, I am sure you join me in the prayer that, even though prepared, they will never be called upon to serve in time of war.

With them let this be your slogan, "Keep your Guard up."

At the conclusion of these remarks, and as a part of this dedication ceremony, I will present to Col. Mahlon Weed, station commander, this United States flag, which at my request was flown over the United States Capitol on the 5th day of August 1953, an anniversary of the 5th day of August 1917.

That date of August 5, 1917, does not mean much to today's generation, but to us older veterans of the National Guard it was a momentous day in our life.

That was the day when all of the National Guard units in the United States were mustered into Federal service for World War I.

Among those guardsmen was our guest, former President Harry S. Truman, who entered service as captain of Battery E, 129th Field Artillery; another was your host, then Sergeant Weed, Company H, 137th Infantry; Pvt. Errett P. Scrivner, later Pfc., took his oath along with them in Battery B, 129th Field Artillery.

Many of the leaders of this city, Kansas City, Kans., ceased being civilians on that day when their units were also mustered into service:

Company A, 137th Infantry.

Battery E, 130th Artillery.

Company B, 110th Engineers.

Company C, 110th Engineers.

Two ambulance companies, 110th Sanitary Train.

A section of ammunition train, 42d Division.

All of us—all of them—are proud of their service—which we will never forget although others may. Our service helped bring victory—just as National Guardsmen always have and always will.

We were proud to serve under our country's flag then—just as we are proud to live under it today.

This flag is more than mere threads of red, white, and blue. In its folds are contained all the glorious history of the past, and the hopes of the future of this great Nation.

And, as Francis Scott Key said, about the Star Spangled Banner, in those closing words of our national anthem:

"Long may it wave o'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

And it will wave long, because this Nation is—has been—and will be the land of the free because it is the home of the brave.

Brave because they have faith—

Faith in themselves—

Faith in their country—

Faith in its future.

And above all because they have an abiding faith in God—the divine providence—that has guided and guarded our beloved Republic for nearly 200 years.

### Where's the Taxpayer's Surplus?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, last month's issue of the U. S. News & World Report, in an article entitled "United States Treasury Strikes It Rich," tells us that for the year ending June 30, 1956, the Government's cash budget is to show a surplus of about \$4,300,000,000.

The Wall Street Journal published on the same day as that article says that the Federal surplus will be only \$2 billion.

Edward L. Dale, Jr., of the New York Times, quoted Mr. Eisenhower as having estimated in January of this year that the budget barely would be in balance, with a surplus of less than \$250 million.

Before this so-called surplus disappears entirely, let us do something with it.

My first choice would, of course, be to use the major portion of any surplus revenue toward a reduction of our national debt, which is presently in the neighborhood of \$280 billion. The administration seems very much in favor of this course.

Some Treasury officials are very proud of our military cutbacks even if we are dollar rich and security poor. Some people could sleep better with less of a cash surplus and, instead, an Air Force second to no other power on earth.

Let us not fool ourselves. There will be no large-scale reduction of the na-

tional debt. This so-called big surplus in the cash budget is quite different from a surplus in the regular budget, for it includes surplus income of social-security payments and other trust funds and excludes certain noncash transactions.

What does all this mean to John Q. Public who has a real tough time with his budget and somehow never has a surplus after he pays his taxes? It means he might stand a little consideration, also.

It is not demagogic to speak of tax reduction. Scientifically, taxes where necessary should be based on the ability to pay. Taxes and the basis for their imposition must be fair. Just as our people demand morality in domestic government and morality in international dealings, taxes must have a morally acceptable basic justification. People in the United States pay very high taxes because they have faith in the justice of their imposition. Heaven help the government whose people heed the anarchistic rantings and ravings of a demagogue such as France has had visited upon her in the person of the infamous Pierre Poujade.

I must stand opposed to tax reduction which has no moral or scientific justification. It is "Poujadism" to reduce taxes just because this is the year of a great national election.

If we have a surplus and taxes can be reduced safely and in good conscience without impairment of our national strength and essential governmental services, then Congress has the responsibility and, indeed, the duty to reduce them. I insist, however, that the reduction should be scientifically and fairly arrived at.

The reduction should be first and foremost for those upon whom the burden of taxes falls most heavily and cruelly. Our primary consideration must be for the man whose major problem is to make both ends meet, the taxpayer who labors under the greatest hardship and has the least ability to pay. Certainly we should eliminate for him any tax which is unfair or unjust before we do anything else in the field of tax reduction.

As a beginning, it occurs to me that a breadwinner must go to work every day. To do so, he requires transportation. This is an essential without which he not alone would be unable to support himself and his family, but likewise, without which he would not be able to earn any income upon which our Government might expect him to pay a tax. The average large business enterprise is permitted deduction from its taxable income of legitimate travel expense. Our Federal Government does not permit deduction of transportation costs from the home to the place of business or employment, in fact, it does not even allow for travel expenses incurred in a journey to another city to accept or seek employment, and I maintain that this poses a classic example of unreality and unfairness in our tax laws and regulations.

Transportation to and from work is a vital item of a man's business expense.

Ordinary public transportation costs for the average citizen are a not inconsiderable amount directly and intimately connected with the business of earning a living or holding a job.

Whether a breadwinner daily travels to his job or place of business by train, bus, trolley, subway, or car, the expense for him in employing these essential facilities has doubled or tripled in recent years. For him, these truly necessary business or job costs are an increasingly heavy burden.

Is it fair, is it morally justifiable that our tax laws and regulations should refuse to allow these expenses as a proper business deduction? Without the expenditure of transportation money from home to job, would there be a job to produce income?

In New York City a working man pays a minimum of \$75 a year just to get from his home to his job and back each working day. This essential outlay is the very minimum he must pay. Many taxpayers are required to pay several times this amount. Commuters living in outlying districts and coming to a city to work each day are spending vastly more. It is sheer hypocrisy on the part of our tax regulations to characterize these sums as "living or personal expense"; they are in truth and in fact, job or business expenses. Why should this taxpayer's legitimate business expense not be deductible? Is this not morally right? Is such an allowance not fair play?

This seems to me to be far more scientific than some of the proposed across-the-board cuts. An increase in dependency exemption is urged by many as being logical, but the present dependency exemptions, in the light of existing living costs, are so unrealistic that a modest increase in the amount of such dependency allowances, which is all that could be expected, would not bring us very much closer to the all important goal of the just and equitable tax base.

I have recently introduced a resolution to study the efficacy of this proposal, its impact and its reasonableness, in the hope that we can approach the question of tax relief morally, scientifically, and fairly—not politically. This is, I think, all that our people ask for and certainly what they have a right to expect of us.

### Has the Sun Gone Down on Reality?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to these words in the committee report on H. R. 11177, the Agriculture Department appropriations bill which we passed yesterday:

Farmers' Home Administration: \* \* \* In the opinion of the committee, attention should be given to a thorough study of the organization and programs of this agency. Recent reports concerning the administration of this organization have been a source of concern to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have had reports which have been a source of concern. Valid complaints about the harshness of Farmers' Home Administration collection policies first came to my attention at a meeting in Hamilton early in December 1954.

In general, they dealt with the impossibility of meeting a repayment schedule, set up several years ago, with today's farm income—which is down about one-third from 1951.

The result has been that many farmers, among them war veterans who have entered the industry in the past few years, do not even have enough money left over to eat or to dress their children properly for school—much less buy seed and fertilizer for another crop, repair and replace machinery, or meet other obligations such as mortgage payments.

I was told that the Farmers' Home Administration Ravalli County supervisor, Mr. Hector E. Rodgers, had stated that of 131 loans in Ravalli County, 80 had been made on uneconomic farm units and that he intended to close them out. Mr. Rodgers was quoted as saying 120 acres is the minimum economic unit in the county.

I asked anyone injured to write me, giving his experiences with the Farmers' Home Administration. Each of the specific cases I received was sent over to Mr. R. B. McLeaish, FHA Administrator. He, in turn, took up each one with the Montana FHA director.

On January 22, 1955, Mr. McLeaish came to my office at my invitation to discuss the situation which, at that time, I understood to be confined to Ravalli County.

He assured me that everyone whose financial condition had changed for the worse since the original contracts were made would be given an opportunity to get money for fertilizer, for feed, seed and for living expenses, even though such withholdings might reduce the Government's share below the required payment.

Mr. McLeaish said he was exploring the possibility of rewriting the payment contracts but, at that time, he did not feel that the notes themselves could be altered.

Although a delinquency would result from release of money for other expenses, including taxes, Mr. McLeaish said all those unable to meet their payments due to a change of markets or reduced farm income would have an opportunity to work out their indebtedness. He said foreclosure was the last thing they wanted to try.

There was discussion of Mr. Rodgers' statement relative to closing out the uneconomic units. Mr. McLeaish said that since the Department had made the loans on these farms, every effort would be made to help the people solve the problem.

This understanding was confirmed in writing by Mr. McLeaish last spring.

Because I heard nothing further from those concerned, I assumed Mr. McLeaish was keeping his promise to give sympathetic consideration to each individual situation.

I was shocked to learn that he was not—and that the attempt to make over a lending agency into a collection agency and thereby change a traditional economic pattern was not confined to Ravalli County.

Just before I returned home for the Easter recess, I was visited in my office by a farmer from Broadwater County. He described the same situation in his vicinity. When I was in Montana last month, I talked to farmers in the vicinity of Townsend and Polson. Several people came to see me about this when I was in Missoula.

As new cases come in, I am continuing to call them to the attention of the Administrator. In addition, I am making my files available to the House Committee on Agriculture which is holding hearings on farm credit bills, among them mine to declare a 1-year moratorium on 4 classes of FHA loans.

The situation in Ravalli County prompted the following editorial by Editor Miles Romney of the Western News, in the May 3, 1956, issue of the weekly newspaper published at Hamilton:

#### HAS THE SUN GONE DOWN ON REALITY?

Elsewhere in this edition is an astounding report of a situation which affects numerous farmers of the Nation and of our country. As I contemplate the matter I ponder over whether people should be indignant or appalled or both.

Some years ago the Congress, aware of the need for providing cheap money to salvage submarginal agriculture, enacted legislation providing the machinery for financing farmers on long- and short-term basis. These were generally cases where private financing was not available, at least at that time.

Through the Federal Farm Home Administration, and its predecessor Federal agencies, thousands of farmers were provided an opportunity to finance their operations with the hope of ultimate full ownership of their farm properties. Many achieved success and others were upon the road to success when the economy of the Nation, insofar as farming is concerned, came upon a decline.

As most people hereabout are well aware prices of farm products have dropped sharply. This decline adversely affected all farmers, and what hurts farmers injures the small-business men of farming communities. In turn everyone in such communities feels the economic consequences of adverse farm prices. It is quite obvious that farmers who had borrowed funds, from no matter what source, had secured such loans when prices were high for commodities they had to sell. When these prices dropped away materially, as they have in the past several years, loans which were predicated upon the higher price plane, became difficult or impossible to pay. Farmers went to their banks and negotiated new loans based upon the current situation. Bankers were generally happy to accommodate their agrarian customers because they recognized realities.

In turn farmers who had loans from the FHA expected similar treatment. Imagine their consternation when they found stern opposition to their prayers for assistance. Instead they were in many instances told they would have to pay upon the basis of their original contracts or be sold out. They were informed, in some instances that they were operating uneconomic units and should quit farming and go to the city and get a job in industry. They encountered no friendliness, no understanding of their cherished



desires for homes and farm operations. Naturally their cups are filled with bitterness.

It is apparently the policy of the Eisenhower administration that small farmers whose properties are not paid for and whose operations are not vast in scope, are not desirable in the American economy. It has been pointed out that they cannot operate upon an equal basis with the gigantic corporation farms. It has been pointed out again and again and again by responsible administration mouthpieces that there are too many farmers today, despite the sharp cut in numbers of persons engaged in agriculture. There can be no denial that the administration's policy has been aimed at reduction of farms and farmers and particularly of the small farmers.

I believe it has been the belief of numerous Americans, during the history of the Republic, that the family farm, owned by those who operate it, has been the foundation of the Nation. It certainly has been the desire to own and operate such units that called the pioneers across the Appalachian Mountains into the new lands of Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Ohio. It lured them across the wide Missouri and thence over the plains. It called them to Utah, to Montana, to Oregon and California. Everywhere men, and their women, were seeking a home of their own, upon land of their own, where they could cultivate the soil, grow their crops and raise their families.

It was such a search by our expanding population that built America. Now there are those who would decimate our farm population. Strangely they are the same characters who screamed their lullabies of dismay and hatred upon the occasion of the destruction, for economic reasons, of the little piggies during the agricultural travail in the early 1930's.

I still think there is nothing finer than for Americans to own their own farms and homes, to operate their own small acreages, their own little shops and maintain an individuality. I think that the original idea of the Farmers' Home Administration's predecessor agencies was splendid and should be encouraged. It was not antagonistic to private banking for it filled a need in which the latter was not interested. It aimed at building a solid agrarian citizenry upon the basis of the family home. Anyone who doesn't like that foundation for America is entitled to his opinion but it is counter to our national practices of generations past, and seems to me to be bad economics.

Because of his personal attitude in handling the situation, the local administrator of FHA, one Mr. Hector Rodgers, has become anathema to Ravalli County borrowers from the agency. Certainly his usefulness in operating the agency here, from the standpoint of the people who are customers of the agency, is ended, except and unless his functions are entirely directed toward closing out the operation as quickly and as ruthlessly as is possible. If such is the aim of the Federal Government, they apparently have the right man on the job here. But I think it unwise to foist all of the blame for this imbroglio upon the shoulders of Mr. Rodgers. To be sure he probably lacks finesse in handling the situation, but he is merely a hired man. He must be taking orders from those who are his superiors in the State FHA setup. They in turn are following directions from their superiors in the national system of the agency and thence all the way up the administrative ladder to the Secretary of Agriculture, whose policies in other respects are akin to those discussed within the framework of this comment. And at the top of the heap, where final responsibility rests, is President Eisenhower himself. To be sure, he cannot be cognizant of such matters in every nook

and corner of the Nation, nor can Mr. Benson, but agricultural strategy is their determination, and such goings-on as have afflicted scores of Bitter Root residents, and many, many more in other areas, is a direct consequence of their decisions. Although we may not like the indecise manner in which Mr. Rodgers accomplishes his mission, real responsibility rests upon the shoulders of those at the top.

This is a sad situation. The administration should review the matter. It should either close the agency altogether and destroy its borrowers or it should alter its methods to bring them in line with economic realities. Nobody could make farming or any other business a success under rules based upon altogether different economic circumstances. I cannot conceive that even the contemporary administration should be so blind as to wish to ruin a healthy segment of the American economy. It is to be hoped Eisenhower and company will awaken to the damage their policy is accomplishing in this respect and speedily remedy it. The Farmers' Home Administration is not now a helping hand for the little farmers, as it was born to be; it is not what it is supposed to be, but instead constitutes a trap, into which unwary persons have been led in good faith, only to learn too late that a supposed friend is a deadly enemy. Let us hope those who have contrived this condition will relent or learn of their error before tragedy ensues.

It is almost inconceivable that just because Mr. Eisenhower knew nothing but destruction before entering the White House, due to having spent his entire manhood in the military, that he would be so blind to the needs of people in his own country.

### Make SUNFED a Part of Our Mutual Security Program and Avoid a Race With the U. S. S. R. as to Which Will Spend the Most

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of thoughtful and prominent citizens are speaking out in favor of channeling more of our foreign aid through the United Nations. The logic of these suggestions seems apparent to me, and I am happy to add my support to the campaign. I include herewith a statement which I made in support of SUNFED during the hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,  
OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in behalf of the mutual security program for fiscal 1957. My support for the general purposes of the program is most emphatic, but I do object, as you shall see, to the emphasis and omissions which the proposals of the administration reveal.

Although not a member of this committee, I have followed with the utmost interest the testimony which you and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have been receiving, particularly from the administration wit-

nesses. One conclusion which I have reached about this testimony is that military necessity forms its leitmotiv. Not only are the President's requests wrapped up in categories which trumpet the military defense aspect and soft-pedal the nonmilitary, but also the supporting testimony consistently sounds the note of hard-headed American military need. One almost wonders, after hearing such advocacy, why we bother with the relatively insignificant technical cooperation and development assistance programs at all. One wonders, too, how anxious the nations who are slated to benefit from such assistance will be to receive their grants when they learn of the military context in which they were pushed through the American Congress. I hope that the Embassies of Asian countries which read the administration's testimony for this legislation will take care to explain to their governments that the appeal of military necessity is a traditional sales technique on Capitol Hill.

If the nations which we propose to help through this legislation took the administration spokesmen completely at their word, I fear they might be frightened into other hands than our own for economic assistance. On the basis of much of the recent testimony, our own hand of economic aid lifts and pushes with the same motion. It lifts a nation's economy and pushes it into a more military posture. Our aid programs are described by the Secretary of State, before this Committee, as purely American in their origin, designed for our benefit, to economize on our defense needs, focused where we want them, and then worked out if possible in cooperation with the nations which receive them. Such a description may make the program more palatable to many American taxpayers in an election year, but I rather doubt that we can go on talking this way before a worldwide audience if we expect to retain the cooperation and respect of the underdeveloped nations which now receive such a large share of our aid. No longer can we offer foreign assistance programs designed in Washington with the assurance that if the needy nations do not accept our offer they will simply have to go without.

The Soviet Union has entered the field of economic and technical assistance and they have certain great advantages over us. The Soviet foreign aid promoters do not have to justify the expenditure of huge sums before a parliamentary forum such as ours. Not only does their dictatorial system of government not require it, but also much of what they offer abroad is based upon barter arrangements which their economy can easily support. Consequently, the agreements which they are ready to make do not become shrouded in the calculating self-interest which is wrapped about our own expenditures each year in Congress. The self-interest of the Soviets undoubtedly underlies their offers, but their system and their economy permit them to avoid professing it. In comparison, the United States must seem blatantly selfish, as our program has been presented this year.

This situation strikes me as terribly serious, Mr. Chairman, because we are only beginning to experience it, and we cannot accurately predict its effect. I regret that the administration has not demonstrated more sensitivity to the changed environment in which our economic and technical-assistance programs must henceforth be carried out. The present requests are made in the same manner as they were in the days when we had a monopoly in the economic-aid field, and the closest thing to recognition of the radically altered circumstances in which we must operate is the administration's acceptance of Senator GEORGE's suggestion that a special study be undertaken of the entire

program. Perhaps the exigencies of preparing budget requests many months in advance have precluded the kind of ready adjustment to the Soviet economic offensive which we would like to see in the President's requests for fiscal 1957. Yet, even conceding such an explanation of the lack of fresh ideas in these requests, there are certain omissions from this proposed program which, to my mind, should be rectified now, without the need of any further study.

The project which I believe is essential to include in next year's mutual-security program is a United States contribution to the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. This special fund, which is commonly known as SUNFED, is an American idea, which has been repeatedly supported in principle by our delegations to the U. N. General Assembly, but which has never been put into action because of our refusal to make any financial contribution. Only 2 months ago, 2 distinguished members of this committee, Mr. Brooks Hays and Mr. Chester Merrow, issued their report on the 10th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at which they, as American delegates, pronounced the official United States position that the actual creation of SUNFED must await the time when substantial savings have been effected through reduction of armaments. In their fine report these Congressmen professed their disagreement with this inflexible approach, stating that they "believe that the United States must not unequivocally insist upon postponing a start toward aid of this type until disarmament becomes a reality." Furthermore, they expressed the view that it would be "of tremendous value to the United States" if we would be prepared at the next meeting of the SUNFED committee to offer constructive modifications of the plan which, if accepted, would enable us to participate.

This is very much needed advice. It is quite incongruous for the United States to find itself as the major stumbling block to the creation of SUNFED, because our Government originally developed the concept of such a special fund. One of the most vigorous suggestions for such a fund was made in the report of the United States International Development Advisory Board on March 7, 1951. This Board, appointed by President Truman, was under the chairmanship of Nelson Rockefeller, who only recently terminated several years of service under President Eisenhower.

In spite of the national emergency of the Korean war at the time which this Board drew up its report, they declared that "strengthening the economies of the underdeveloped regions and an improvement in their living levels must be considered a vital part of our own defense mobilization." The Board recommended that an international development authority be created to finance a portion of the cost of public works which are essential to the underdeveloped countries and which cannot attract loans from existing financial agencies. To use the language of economists, this report recommended an international fund, making "the fullest use of the United Nations and other international organizations," to invest in non-self-liquidating projects, to provide the fundamental economic structure needed in countries before private investment capital can undertake to develop their economies. In the underdeveloped areas of the world the prerequisites to economic expansion—such as roads, railways, ports and airfields, hospitals and schools, irrigation and drainage, clearing of land—most of these must be provided before private investors can be attracted in support of self-liquidating or profitable activities and industries.

The SUNFED proposal aimed at getting the wealthier nations of the world, which

developed their economic foundations in the expansive frontier days of the last 100 years, to contribute a small amount of funds to an international effort to lift their less fortunate neighbors over the first hurdle to economic self-development. By combining their efforts through the existing structure of the United Nations the "have" nations would give that essential first push, through long terms loans or outright grants to the "have nots" to get them under way economically. Once this could be done, the less fortunate nations would be able to run on their own resources. The underdeveloped countries could then begin to offer to private or public investors transportation facilities for moving products to market, communication systems, a trained and healthy labor force and a growing managerial class.

The logic of this proposal seems obvious to me. One does not need an advanced degree in economics to understand the importance of building the basic structure of a country before investing in the more complicated economic enterprises which will ultimately make it self-sufficient. It is hard for me to understand how a nation as proud of its business acumen as is ours can fail to support, with dollars as well as words, the SUNFED program. What sense does it make, from a strictly financial point of view, to go on investing in technical cooperation and economic assistance as we are doing when we refuse to contribute funds which would enable the "have not" countries to lay a firm groundwork for the economies which we are helping to bolster on a piecemeal basis? It cannot be said that these countries can find private investors to develop their schools and hospitals and irrigation projects, because these undertakings are not self-liquidating and do not attract foreign capital. Only through the beneficence of some private or public agency can funds be obtained for such non-profit-yielding investments.

The special United Nations fund as presently planned would begin with capital amounting to \$250 million, of which the United States is asked to contribute less than one-third. If our Government would put up the \$80 million requested of us, the remaining funds would not be long in following. The amount which we are asked to contribute is less than half of what the President has requested for development assistance in this year's United States program. Eighty million dollars is only slightly more than half of the amount that we are asked to contribute to our own Technical Cooperation program. Yet, by investing this relatively small amount we would find it trebled through the contributions of other members of the United Nations, and we would not need to replenish it in the same or larger amounts each year, as we do with our unilateral development funds.

I realize that it is often argued that United Nations programs do not redound to our credit, as our own assistance projects are supposed to do. Of course, many Americans argue that we receive no gratitude whatsoever from our aid programs, and, though I disagree with this idea, I do believe that the credit which we receive for our projects is less than many taxpayers would like to think. Yet, granting that we do make some friends abroad from economic and technical assistance, it is time for us to reorient our thinking on this subject and drop the purely cold-war approach to foreign aid. Whether we like it or not, the Soviet Union has entered the foreign aid business and we cannot hope to keep them out by underselling or trading on our past generosity. Instead, it is time for us to adopt an attitude of long-range self-interest, which in short-range will be humanitarian and unselfish. We should face up to the fact that the economic development of the less advanced nations of the world will be to the greater eco-

nomic advantage of all trading countries, and particularly our own; and we can no longer hope unilaterally to make this economic advancement possible and win exclusive political advantage thereby.

I ask the committee to consider the wisdom of shifting more of our economic assistance to the multilateral structure of the United Nations. By so doing we challenge the Soviet Union to demonstrate their own professed selfless desire for human betterment by contributing comparable amounts. We also increase the economic value of each dollar we invest, because it will be more than matched by the contributions of other member nations. We will find too that many more projects can be undertaken effectively under U. N. auspices than our own, because many nations, for political reasons, are more willing to have multilateral rather than United States sponsored projects undertaken within their frontiers. Also, U. N. programs often find personnel to draw upon who are more qualified in languages and tropical experience than are our own. If we are truly interested in our long-range objective of a more prosperous world trade, then the above considerations are of great importance.

Gradually some of our far-seeing leaders in both private and governmental positions are beginning to expound this insight. Willard Thorp, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in favor of SUNFED more than a year ago. The present Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs, Francis Wilcox, in a speech last January to the National Press Club, spoke in favor of SUNFED and expressed the hope that "ways and means will be found for the United States to participate constructively in such a fund." More recently, our Ambassador to the United Nations, John Cabot Lodge, has stated, as reported by the Washington Post of April 30, 1956, that the present world situation requires the United States to channel a larger share of its foreign aid through the U. N. The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs, issued on May 7, 1956, states in cautious bipartisan language that an increase in the absolute amount of United States contribution to the U. N. programs "might be justified," provided other nations increase their amounts.

An increasing number of private individuals and organizations have also spoken out in favor of more aid through the United Nations and more concentration upon the humane rather than the cold war aspect of economic assistance. Chester Bowles made a strong plea for our joining SUNFED in a speech to the Cleveland Council of World Affairs on April 18, 1956. Adlai Stevenson has spoken in a similar vein. Victor Reuther of the United Auto Workers and Jacob Potofsky, vice president of the AFL-CIO have also supported SUNFED, for many years. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt is prominent among the members of a new committee to support an expanded foreign-aid program, which strongly urges Congress to support SUNFED with an appropriation this year.

Mr. Chairman, it becomes apparent to me that our situation requires and public opinion is beginning to support a new concept of foreign aid which will give greater emphasis to multilateral programs and fundamental development, along with piecemeal projects. It would be an act of true statesmanship for this committee to consider now including the long-awaited United States contribution to SUNFED as a part of this mutual security program. Such a step would redound to the benefit of our national interests and would win for this committee the utmost credit for imaginative response to the changing international situation which confronts us.



## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose sight all that concerns Thy children is precious, and whose merciful eyes note even a sparrow's fall: Speak to these struggling lives of ours, woven with such strangely tangled threads. Thou knowest all the days that go to make the total pattern as the years pass more quickly than a weaver's shuttle, days shadowed by sorrow, sparkling with mirth, bathed in tears, lifted up by gain and triumph, cast down by failure and loss. May all this medley of hopes and fears find its true meaning in Thy eternal purpose for our being.

In this violently agitated day open our eyes to perceive Thy presence in the mighty movements of these times, and to trust Thy wise and patient power to fashion a better day out of the strife and turmoil, the grief and bitterness, of this present time. In the deliberations of the Congress let every mind be attentive to Thy voice in this solemn day of global decisions, that we may know the things which belong to our peace and to the peace of the world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 7, 1956, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3254) to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally

with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Eric A. Cummings;

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stullin;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Bok-soon;

S. 2972. An act to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7513) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9132) to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Amoresano and her children;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas;

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 3532. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

H. R. 3897. An act to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Vivencio Fernado Raymundo, Bienvenida Raymundo, Lolita Raymundo, Agnes Raymundo, Henry Raymundo, and Fred Raymundo;

H. R. 5256. An act to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 7144. An act to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service-connected;

H. R. 7190. An act restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7835. An act for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 8290. An act to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8385. An act to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8458. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion) who married the veteran before January 1, 1938, may be eligible for death compensation;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson;

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance;

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.;

H. R. 9451. An act to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Seminole Indians and to provide that certain lands shall be designated as a reservation for Seminole Indians;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina;

H. R. 9841. An act to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased \$600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs;